

AN INTRODUCTION TO CLASSICAL SANSKRIT

AN INTRODUCTORY TREATISE OF THE HISTORY OF
CLASSICAL SANSKRIT LITERATURE

BY

GAURINATH BHATTACHARYYA SHASTRI MA

Premchand Roychand Student Lecturer in Sanskrit at the
Pr sidency College and at the University of Calcutta

MODERN BOOK AGENCY
10 College Square Calcutta —
1943

Published by
U G Bhattacharyya,
10, College Square, Calcutta

ed by A N Mukherjee,
M I PRESS,
Grev Street, Calcutta

To the sacred memory of
my parents

PREFACE

The impetus to the writing of the present work came from my students at the Presidency College Calcutta. The paucity of suitable text books on the subject intended for Degree and Post Graduate students of Indian Universities was felt by myself in my college life and in writing this book I have always borne in mind the difficulties which our students feel in tackling the subject. The work therefore does not pretend to be very ambitious.

In the preparation of the book I have freely consulted the two monumental works of M. Winteritz and A. B. Keith. To them therefore I am under a deep debt of gratitude. I must also acknowledge my indebtedness to all those authorities whose works have been mentioned in the References.

In preparing the press copy my pupil Professor Surendra Nath Bhanja Sibyasastra Kavya Vidyatirtha M.A. has rendered invaluable service. Another pupil of mine Mr Taraknath Chakraborty M.A. has prepared the major part of the Index. My colleagues Professor Upendranath Chakraborty M.A. Ph.D. and Professor Subodhchandra Sengupta M.A. P.R.S. Ph.D. had the kindness the former to find out for me a few references and the latter to read a considerable portion of the work while in the press. My teachers Mahatma Biplab Karmakar Haranchandra Shastri Professor Sadananda Bhaduri M.A. Ph.D. and Professor Somnath Mantra M.A. have helped me much by offering valuable suggestions from time to time. I must also acknowledge the advice given so freely by my friend and colleague Professor Taraknath Sen M.A. Lastly I must mention the deep interest which was taken by my cousin Pandit Ashokanath Shastri Vedintatirtha M.A. P.R.S. in seeing the work through.

The occasion makes me remember with deep and reverent

gratitude, those of my teachers at whose feet I had the privilege of studying the subject—the late Professor Rakhal Das Banerjee, M.A., of the Benares Hindu University, and Professor Nilmoni Chakravarty, M.A., late Senior Professor of Sanskrit, Presidency College, Calcutta

I am thankful to my publishers, the Modern Book Agency, Calcutta, and to the authorities of the M. I. Press, Calcutta, for the kind interest they have taken in the printing and publication of my book

Calcutta,

Author

January, 1943

ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
Introductory	1—22
Origin of Indian writing—Vedic and Classical Indian languages their relationship—Prakrit—Was Sanskrit a spoken language?	
Chapter One The Great Epics	23—37
Rāmāyaṇa Origin and story—Character—Spurious element—Antiquity—Relation to Buddhism—Greek influence—Allegorical interpretation—Mythological interpretation	
Māhabhārata General character and story—Gita—Three stages—Age—Literary and inscriptive evidence—Which of the two Epics is earlier?	
Chapter Two The Purāṇas	38—43
Introduction—Age and antiquity—Character and value—Name and number of Purāṇas—Devimāhātmya—Name and number of Upapurāṇas	
Chapter Three The Tantras	44—47
Meaning contents and classification—Relation to Vedic literature—Antiquity—Home—Works	
Chapter Four Kīrīya in inscriptions	48—50
Renaissance Theory of Max Müller—Gīrṇī and Nīśīk inscriptions—Conclusions	
Chapter Five Early Buddhist works in Sanskrit	51—74
Introduction—Works belonging to Mahayāna and Hinayāna schools (i) Poetical (ii) Philosophical (iii) Avadāna	

		PAGES
Chapter Seventeen	Politics	180—181
Introduction—Works on Politics		
Chapter Eighteen	Froties	182—183
Introduction—Works on Froties		
Chapter Nineteen	Medicine	184—186
History of medical literature—Larhei and later medical works		
Chapter Twenty	Astronomy Mathematics and Astrology	187—191
History of Astronomy—Works on Astronomy—Works on Mathematics—Works on Astrology		
Chapter Twenty One	Miscellaneous Sciences	192—194
Archery—Sciences of elephants and horses—Sciences of jewels steering cooking music dancing and painting		
Chapter Twenty Two	Philosophy	195—237
Orthodox systems Nyāya Vaishika Sāṅkhya Yogi Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta—Heterodox systems Buddhism Jainism and Materialism—Miscellaneous works on philosophy		
Appendix	History of the Study of Sanskrit in the West	1—11

ABBREVIATIONS

ABORI	Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute	<i>KL</i>	<i>Karmavatana</i>
1st	<i>1stidhyayī</i>	<i>KS</i>	<i>Kanāñtra</i>
<i>Har</i>	<i>Harasacita</i>	<i>MB</i>	<i>Mahabhaṭṭī</i>
HOS	Harvard Oriental Series	<i>Mbh</i>	<i>Mahabhaṭṭī</i>
IA	Indian Antiquary	<i>Nī</i>	<i>Nīvīta</i>
JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society	<i>Rāg</i>	<i>Rāghuvamī</i>
<i>Kād</i>	<i>Kādambarī</i> (M R Kale 2nd edition)	<i>Rām</i>	<i>Rāmavatana</i>
		<i>Rāvī</i>	<i>Rāvīla</i>
		<i>SBE</i>	Sacred Books of the East, Oxford
		<i>SD</i>	<i>Sahityadarpanam</i>
		<i>SI</i>	<i>Śiśupālaivalī</i>
		<i>Vās</i>	<i>Vasavatītī</i>

•

ERRATA

Pp 119 &c	Line 1	For 'Chapter Six' read 'Chapter Eight' and emend all subsequent chapter numberings accordingly
P 193	Line 13	For 'Sanmukhakalpa' read 'Sammukhakalpa'

AN INTRODUCTION TO CLASSICAL SANSKRIT INTRODUCTORY

A

ORIGIN OF INDIAN WRITING

The immemorial practice with students of Sanskrit literature has been to commit to memory the various subjects of their study, and this practice of oral tradition has preserved the ancient Vedic texts. This fact has led scholars to surmise that writing was perchance unknown in the earliest period of Indian civilization and that the later forms of the alphabet were not of pure Indian growth.

Introduction

The earliest references to writing in Sanskrit literature are to be found in the *Dharmasutras* of Visistha, which, as Dr Buhler thinks, was composed about the eighth century B.C. There are, however, some scholars who would like to assign a much later date to the work, viz., the fourth century B.C. There we obtain clear evidence of the widely spread use of writing during the Vedic

Evidence of
Vedic and
Sutra
works

period, and in Ch XVI 10, 14-15, mention is made of written documents as legal evidence. Further, the *Astādhyāyī* of Pāṇini contains such compounds as 'lipikara' and 'libikara' which evidently mean 'writer' [III ii 21]. The date of Pāṇini, however, is not fixed. Professor Goldstucker wants to place him in the eighth century B.C., while the general body of scholars holds that his age is the fourth century B.C. In addition to the few references set forth above, it may be said that the later Vedic works contain some technical terms such as 'akṣara,' 'hānda,' 'patala,' 'grantha' and the like, which some scholars quote as evidence of the use of writing. But there are others who like to differ in their interpretations of these terms.

The aforesaid references do not help us much in determining the genuine Indian growth of writing, inasmuch as none of the works in which they are found can be safely dated earlier than the period of inscriptions. In the same way, evidences in the Brāhma-nical works such as the Epics, the Purāṇas, the Kāvyas and the like, are of little or no help. Among them, the Epics are by far the oldest, but it is difficult to prove that every word of them text goes back to a high anti-

quity. One fact is however, undeniable, viz. that the Epics contain some archaic expressions such as, 'lilh, 'lelha, lelhala 'lekhana, but not 'lipi, which, as many scholars think, is after all a foreign word. This may suggest that writing was known in India in the Epic age.

There are two other facts which also suggest the same thing. It is believed that the Aryans were in an advanced state of civilization—there was a high development of trade and monetary transactions and that they carried on minute researches in grammar, phonetics and lexicography. Do not the above facts presuppose the knowledge of the art of writing among the ancient Indians? Nevertheless, one will have to adduce positive evidence, without which nothing can be taken for granted. So we turn to the Buddhist works.

There are quite a large number of passages in the Ceylonese *Tipitaka*, which bear witness to an acquaintance with writing and to its extensive use at the time when the Buddhist canon was composed. 'Lekha and 'lelhala are mentioned in the *Bhikkhu Pacittiya* 2, ii and in the *Bhikkhuni Pacittiya* 49, ii. In the former, writing has been highly

Evidence of
Indian civi-
lization

Evidence of
Buddhist
writings

praised. In the Jātakas, constant mention is made of letters. The Jātakas know of proclamations. We are also told of a game named *akārakā* in which the Buddhist monk is forbidden to participate. This game was in all probability one of guessing at letters. In the rules of Vinaya, it has been laid down that a criminal, whose name has been written up in the King's porch must not be received into the monastic order. In the same work, writing has been mentioned as a lucrative profession. Jātaka No. 125 and the *Mahāvagga*, I 49 bear witness to the existence of elementary schools where the manner of teaching was the same as in the indigenous schools of modern India. All these references prove the existence of the art of writing in pre-Buddhistic days.

The earliest written record is the Pīprāwā vase inscription which was discovered sometime ago by Colonel Claxton Peppe. This inscription is written in Brāhma character and is in a language which does not conform to any of the standard Pākñits. Some of the case-endings tend towards Māgadhi. No compound consonant has been written. They have been either simplified or divided.

by epenthesis. No long vowel, excepting two 'e's, have been used. The inscription has been differently interpreted. According to some scholars the relics that were enshrined were the relics of Buddha while others maintain that the relics were those of the Sakyas who were massacred by Viulaka son of Prasenjit, King of Kosala. In any case the inscription belongs to the early part of the fifth century B.C.

Next in order of antiquity comes the Sohgaura copper plate which, as Dr. Smith thinks, may be dated about half a century prior to Asoka.¹ The characters of the document according to Dr. Smith are those of the Brahmi of the Maurya period and his statements, according to Dr. Buhler, are incontestable as everyone of them is traceable in the Edicts. About the proper import

Sohgaura
Copper
plate

¹The English translation of Dr. Buhler's version is given below

The order of the great officials of Srivasti (issued) from (their camp at) Mānavasitikata— These two store houses with three partitions (which are situated) even in famous Vamsagrīma require the storage of loads (bhīraka) of Black Panicum parched grain cummin seed and Amba for (times of) urgent (need) One should not take (anything from the grain stored) — IA Vol XXV pp 261—66

of the inscription none is sure Dr Smith says that he cannot find out any meaning from it The value of the inscription rests on the fact that it is an evidence for the assumption that in the third century B C , the use of writing was common in royal offices and that the knowledge of written characters was widely spread among the people

The inscriptions of Aśoka, are found almost all over India and are written in two different scripts, viz , Brāhmī and Kharosthī Two of these inscriptions that of Shāhbāzgāhī and Mānsehīā, are written in the latter The rest are written in Brāhmī The language of early Indian inscriptions is not Sanskrit, but vernacular, which is known as Prākrit In the inscriptions of Aśoka, local varieties are to be found Those in the north-western part of India incline more towards Pāsācī, than those found in the eastern part It is interesting to note that all the Indian inscriptions from the earliest times down to the second century A D , are in Prākrit The earliest inscription in Sanskrit is the Nāsik Cave No X inscription of Nahapāna, which was written, in all probability, in the year 41 of the Śaka era, corresponding to 119 A D But there

are scholars who do not like to call this inscription the earliest in Sanskrit and in their opinion the well known Junagadh inscription of Rudradaman dated 150 A.D. heads the list of Sanskrit inscriptions. Sanskrit gradually encroached upon Prakrit in the field of epigraphy and it was from the fifth century A.D. that Prakrit disappeared from the field of inscription.

As for the history of the two scripts Brahmi and Kharosthi mentioned above Dr Buhler thinks that the latter was derived from the Aramaic or Phoenician character used by the clerks of the Persian Empire. The north western parts of India came under the Achaemenian or Persian rule about the sixth century B.C. And it is in those parts of India that inscriptions and coins in Kharosthi character have been discovered. Dr Buhler has taken sufficient pains to show how from some borrowed letters the full alphabet of the Sanskrit language came into being. There are some scholars who have gone so far as to suggest a meaning of the word Kharosthi. Thus it is held that the name Kharosthi has been derived from the shape of letters which generally resemble the lip of an ass. Professor Levi

Kharosthi

thinks that the word is derived from the name of the inventor, Kharostha, an inhabitant of Central Asia

There are several theories regarding the origin of the Brāhmī character. According to Dr Taylor and others, the Brāhmī character was borrowed from a Southern Arab tribe. This theory has not gained any popularity. The theory started by Dr Weber and illustrated by Dr Buhler is generally accepted. Dr Weber was the first man to discover that some of the old Indian letters are practically identical with certain Assyrian letters and several letters in some inscriptions of the ninth and the seventh centuries B C, found in Assyria. About one-third of the *twenty-three* letters of the North Semitic alphabet of that period is identical with the oldest forms of the corresponding Indian letters. Another one-third is somewhat similar, while the rest can with great difficulty be said to correspond to letters of the Indian alphabet. Dr Buhler took advantage of this theory of Dr Weber, and he next proceeded to show that as a result of the prolonged contact between Indian merchants, mostly, Dravidians, and Babylonians in the eighth and the seventh centuries B C,

the former availed themselves of the opportunity to bring the Assyrian art of writing over to India, which later on was enlarged to suit the requirements of the Indian people. Nearly a thousand years later this form of writing came to be styled as Brahmi. It has been said that originally the letters were written from right to left as a single coin has been discovered in a place named Iru on which the legend runs from right to left. But as the Brahmanas believed the right hand direction to be sacred they changed the direction and began to write from left to right.

According to Professor Rhys Davids the Indian letters were developed neither from the Northern nor from the Southern Semitic alphabet, but from the pre Semitic form current in the Euphrates valley. But this theory is not accepted on the ground that this supposed pre Semitic form of writing has yet to be explored.

Sir Alexander Cunningham had wanted to derive each letter from the indigenous hieroglyphic, but his theory was discarded on the ground that no such hieroglyphic could be found in India. But the recent excavations at Mathura and Hirappur

Pre Semitic
origin

Hierogly-
phic origin

have brought to light, an original Indian hieroglyphic, and a further examination of the theory once started by Sir A. Cunningham may be undertaken.

REFERENCES

Buhler, G (i) Indian Paleography
 (ii) The Origin of Brāhmī Alphabet
 (iii) The origin of the Kharosthī Alphabet (IA Vol XXIV)
 (iv) Indian Studies III

Cunningham, A The Coins of Ancient India

Cust, R. N. On the origin of the Indian alphabet
 JRAS Vol XVI (New series)

Lévi, S (i) Indian Writing (IA Vol XXXIII)
 (ii) Kharosthī and the Kharosthī writing
 (IA Vol XXXV)

Mitra, P New Light from Pre-historic India
 (IA Vol XLVIII)

Shamasastri, R A theory of the origin of the Devanagari alphabet (IA Vol XXXV)

Taylor, I The Alphabet

Thomas, E Princep's Essays, Vol II

B

VEDIC AND CLASSICAL INDIAN LANGUAGES—THEIR RELATIONSHIP

dominant language of India for a period covering over four thousand years. Viewed from its rich heritage of literature, its fascinating charm of words, its flexibility of expression in relation to thought Sanskrit occupies a singular place in the literature of the world.

The Sanskrit language is generally divided into Vedic and Classical. In the Vedic language was written the entire sacred literature of the Aryan Indians. Within this Vedic language several stages may be carefully distinguished, and in course of its transition from the one to the other it gradually grew modern till it ultimately merged in Classical Sanskrit. But when we pass on from the Vedic lyrics to the lyrics of Classical Sanskrit we seem to enter a 'new world'. Not only are the grammar, vocabulary, metre and style different, but there is also a marked distinction in respect of matter and spirit. Thus the Classical Sanskrit period is marked by a change of religious outlook and social conditions. Vedic literature is almost entirely religious but Classical Sanskrit has a profane aspect as well which is not in any way inferior to the religious aspect. The religion in the Epic period has become different from

Vedic and
Classical
difference
in matter
and spirit

what it was in the Vedic age. The Vedic Nature-worship has been superseded by the cult of Brahma, Visnu and Siva, and it is in the Epic period that we find for the first time the incarnations of Visnu who has come to be looked upon as the Supreme Deity. New gods and goddesses unknown to the Vedas have arisen, and Vedic gods have either been forgotten or reduced to a subordinate position. India is, indeed, the only god who still maintains high status as the lord of heaven. Vedic literature in its earlier phase was marked by a spirit of robust optimism but Classical Sanskrit literature has a note of pessimism owing probably to the influence of the doctrine of *karma* and transmigration of soul. The naive simplicity of Vedic literature is strikingly absent in Classical Sanskrit where the introduction of the supernatural and the wonderful is full of exaggeration. So kings are described as visiting India in heaven and a sage creating a new world by means of his great spiritual powers. The tribal organization of the state has lessened much in importance in the Epic period where we find the rise of many territorial kingdoms.

In respect of form also Classical Sanskrit

differs considerably from Vedic. Thus the four Vedas and the Brahmanas are marked with accents (*udatta, anudatta and svarita*) which only can help us in finding out the meaning of different words. Thus, for instance, the word '*Indrasatru*' with one kind of accent will mean 'Indra is enemy' and the same word with a different kind of accent will imply 'enemy of Indra'. But in Classical Sanskrit literature, accent has no part to play.

Phonetically Vedic and Classical languages are identical, but grammatically they differ. The change in grammar is not generally due to the introduction of new formations or inflections but to the loss of forms.¹ In respect of mood the difference between Classical and Vedic Sanskrit is specially very great. In the Vedas the present tense has besides its indicative inflection

Difference in form
(i) accent

¹ Certain grammatical forms which occur in Vedic language disappear in Classical. Thus in declension a number of forms has been dropped — (i) the nominative and accusative dual forms of —*a* stems ending in —*ā* e.g. *nānā* (ii) the nominative plural form of —*a* stems ending in —*āsah* e.g. *deśāsah* (iii) the instrumental plural form of —*a* stems ending in —*ebhīh* e.g. *deśebhīh* etc.

a subjunctive (requsition), optative (wish) and an imperative (command). The same three moods are found, though with much less frequency, as belonging to the perfect and they are also made from the aorists (*lun*) and the future has no moods. In Classical Sanskrit, the present tense adds to its indicative an optative and an imperative. But the subjunctive (*let*) is lost in Classical Sanskrit¹. In the Vedic period no less than fifteen forms of infinitive were used² of which only one (*tum*) survives in the Classical period. Vedic Sanskrit differs from Classical Sanskrit in respect of the use of prefixes (*upasargas*). Thus in Classical Sanskrit the *upasarga* must invariably precede the root and should form a part of it. But the use of *upasargas* was unrestricted in Vedic Sanskrit. It was used before the root and after it and was also sometimes separated from the root itself³. Compounds of more than two words, which are rare in the Vedas and the Brāhmaṇas, are frequent in Classical Sanskrit.

¹ *adya jīvānū, śatam jīvātī śoradah*, etc., as found in the Veda

² *Ast III iv 9*

³ *ā hi snena rajasā vartamāno*, etc.

The aforesaid changes in respect of forms were mainly due to the efforts of grammarians who exercised considerable influence on the development of the language. The vocabulary also underwent many changes. It was largely extended by derivation, composition and compilation. Many old words that could not be found in Vedic literature came to be added in Classical Sanskrit and many new words were borrowed.

Vedic language again differs from Classical with regard to the use of metres. Beside the principal seven metres of the Vedas (*gayatri*, *usnih anu tubh*, *brihati*, *pankti*, *tri tubh* and *jagati*) Classical Sanskrit presents a limitless variety of metres.

REFERENCES

Ghate V S Lectures on the Rgveda
 Kielhorn F A Grammar of Sanskrit Language
 Macdonell A A (i) A History of Sanskrit Literature
 (ii) A Vedic Grammar
 (iii) Vedic Mythology
 Weber A The History of Indian Literature
 Whitney W D A Sanskrit Grammar
 Williams M A Practical Grammar of the Sanskrit Language
 Winternitz M A History of Indian Literature
 Vol I

(iii) Vocabulary

(iv) Metre

C

PRĀKRIT

Antiquity The beginnings of the Prākrits go back to a period of great antiquity. Even at the time when Vedic hymns were composed, there existed a popular language which differed from the literary dialect. In the Vedic hymns, there are several words which cannot be phonetically other than Prākrit. Buddha and Mahāvīra preached their doctrines in the sixth century B.C., in the language of the people in order that all might understand them. The language of the Buddhist texts which were collected during the period between 500 B.C. and 400 B.C., was Māgadhi. The extant Buddhist texts of Ceylon, Burma and Siam are in a form of popular language to which the name Pāli has been given. There is difference of opinion amongst scholars regarding the place and origin of Pāli. The only inscription, the language of which is akin to Pāli, is the Hāti-Gumphā inscription of Khāravela, dated the 160th year of the Maurya era.

Patañjali says that Sanskrit was a spoken language, but it was confined to the cultured section of the people. The popular dialect

of India was known by the general name of Prākrit. From the distribution of languages in Sanskrit dramas it appears that the masses while speaking Prākrit could understand Sanskrit. It has been said in Bhāratas *Nātyaśāstra* that Prākrit and Sanskrit are different branches of one and the same language. In the earliest known forms of Prakrit, there are passages which can be easily translated into Sanskrit by the application of simple phonetic rules.

According to European scholars, Prakrit, which represents the Middle Indian period of the Indo Aryan languages, may again be subdivided into three stages (1) Old Prākrit or Pali, (2) Middle Prākrit, and (3) late Prākrit or Apabhramsa. They would like to say that if Prakrit had been a language derived from Sanskrit, Prakrit would have taken the name Sanskrta. Moreover, there are many words and forms in Prākrit which cannot be traced in Classical Sanskrit. If, however, by the word Sanskrit is included the language of the Vedas and all dialects of the old Indian period, it will be correct to assume that Prākrit is derived from Sanskrit. But the word Sanskrit is generally used to refer to the Pānini Patañjali language.

European view

18 AN INTRODUCTION TO CLASSICAL SANSKRIT

Orthodox view

Indian grammarians, however, would say that the name *Piākīt* is derived from the word *piākṛti*, which means 'the basic form', viz., Sanskrit. Further, in *Piākīt* there are *three* classes of words, e.g., (i) 'tatsama' words which are identical in form and meaning in both Sanskrit and *Piākīt*, e.g., *dava*, *hamala*, (ii) 'tadbhava' words that are derived from Sanskrit by the application of phonetic rules, e.g., *ajjautta* < *āryaputta*, *paricumbra* < *paricumbya*, and (iii) "desin" words that are of indigenous origin and the history of which cannot be accurately traced, e.g., *chollanti*, *canga*. A careful examination of *Piākīt* vocabulary reveals the fact that the majority of *Piākīt* words belong to the second class, words belonging to the other classes are comparatively small in number. The derivatives are in most cases the result of phonetic decay.

Varieties of
Prākīt

The following are the more important literary *Piākīts*. *Mahārāstī*, *Saurasenī*, *Māgadhi* are the dramatic *Piākīts*, while *Aīdha-Māgadhi*, *Jaina-Mahārāstī*, *Jaina-Saurasenī* are the *Piākīts* of the *Jaina* canon. The last is the *Apabhramśa*.

REFERENCES

Bhandarkar R G Wilson Philological Lectures
(Lecture III)
Vararuchi *Prakrtapraakasha*
Woolner A C Introduction to Sanskrit

D

WAS SANSKRIT A SPOKEN
LANGUAGE?

A section of European scholars would believe that in spite of the vast extent of Sanskrit literature Sanskrit was never used in actual speech. It was a purely literary and artificial language and the language that was spoken even in ancient times was Prakrit.

European view

But there are evidences to show that to all intents and purposes, Sanskrit was a living language and that it was spoken by at least a large section of the people. Tytlerologists and grammarians like Yāska and Pāṇini describe Classical Sanskrit as *Bhāṣā*—the speech, as distinguished from Vedic Sanskrit,¹ and it will not probably be incorrect to suggest that this description serves to draw out the

Orthodox view

¹ *Ait. I* n. 577 *II* n. 657 *A* { *III* n. 108 etc

special character of Classical Sanskrit as a living speech. Moreover, there are many sūtras in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini which are meaningless unless they have any reference to a living speech.¹ Yāska, Pāṇini and even Kātyāyana have discussed the peculiarities in the usages of Easterners and Northerners.² Local variations are also noticed by Kātyāyana, while Patañjali has collected words occurring in particular districts.³ Patañjali again tells us that the words of Sanskrit are of ordinary life and describes an anecdote in which a grammarian converses with a charioteer and the discussion is carried on in Sanskrit.⁴

From all that has been said above, it is clear that Sanskrit was a living speech in ancient India. But the question which still remains to be discussed is whether Sanskrit was the vernacular of all classes of people in the society or of any particular section or sections. Patañjali says that the

Extent of
Sanskrit as
a spoken
language

¹ *Aṣṭ* VIII iv 48, etc. Also *Ganasutras*, Nos 18, 20, 29

² *Nṛ* II ii 8 *Aṣṭ* IV i 157 & 160

³ Cf. *Vārttika*, “*sarve deśāntare*” referred to in the *Paspāśāhnikā*, *MB*

⁴ *MB* under *Aṣṭ* II iv 56

the language spoken in the days of Panini could be mastered if it was heard from the learned Brahmins of the day (6. 1) who could speak correct Sanskrit without any special tuition¹. It is gathered from the *Sardaraloka* of the *Jamavaris* that the language spoken by the twice-born caste was Sanskrit. It is told in the *Kumudastra* of Vidyavirya that men of the caste should speak both in Sanskrit and the vernacular of the province and that in this the Sanskrit was not the spoken language of each and every section of the people in the society². Human I-sing, the Chinese traveller (eighth century A.D.) tells us that the language in which official documents were arranged was Sanskrit and not any provincial dialect. The *Panccharita* informs us that the medium of instruction for the young boys of the ruling class was Sanskrit and not any vernacular.

We may draw from this the conclusion that Sanskrit was the vernacular of the educated people but it was understood in still wider sections. Our conclusions may find support from the evidence of the dramatic literature where we observe

Conclusions

¹ *MB* und *r. 44 VI* in 109. ² *Im V* xxx 18

¹ *AS* iv 20

that Brāhmaṇas, kings and ministers speak Sanskrit while women and all the common people use Pākīt, except that nuns and courtesans occasionally converse in Sanskrit. Uneducated Brāhmaṇas are introduced speaking popular dialects. But it is highly significant that the dialogues between Sanskrit-speaking and Pākīt-speaking persons are very frequent and this suggests that in real life Sanskrit was understood by those who would not speak it themselves. This statement may be further corroborated by the fact that common people would gather to hear the recital of the popular Epics in the palaces of kings and in temples, they would not attend such functions unless they could understand the content of the recital.

REFERENCES

Bhandarkar, R. G. Wilson Philological Lectures (Lecture VII)

Keith, A. B. A History of Sanskrit Literature

Macdonell, A. A. A History of Sanskrit Literature

Pathak, K. B. The Age of Pāṇini and Sanskrit as a spoken language (ABORI Vol. XI)

Rapson, E. J. JRAS 1904

CHAPTER ONE

THE GREAT EPICS

A

RĀMĀYANA

The Indian tradition makes Vālmīki the author of the *Ramayana*, the first poet (*adikavi*) who is reported to have been deeply moved by the piteous wailings of the female cormorant when her husband was killed by the dart of a forester. Vālmīki's feelings found an expression through the medium of metre,¹ and at the bidding of the divine sage Narada who brought messages from Brāhma he composed the immortal Rāma Epic which tells the story of Prince Rāma, the dutiful and devoted son of King Dasaratha of Ayodhya, who was banished from his kingdom for fourteen years through the jealousy of his step mother Kaikeyi who secured possession of the throne for her son Bharata. So Rama and Sīta, his beloved wife accompanied by the third prince Lakṣmīna went to the forest. There the adventures of the banished prince Sīta's abduction by Rāvana King of Lanka, the help given to Rama

Origin
and story

¹ Rām I n 15 Also cf Rag XIV 70

by Hanumat, a chief of the monkeys, the destruction of Rāvana and his party, the fire-ideal of Sītā to prove her chastity these and many other incidents have been described in all the glowing colours of poetry

The *Rāmāyana* which is essentially a poetic creation has influenced the thought and poetry of later centuries in course of which new matters were added to the original composition. The work, in its present form and extent, comprises seven books and contains 24000 verses approximately. But it must be remembered that the text of the Epic has been preserved in three recensions, the West Indian, the Bengal and the Bombay, and curiously enough each recension has almost one third of the verses occurring in neither of the other two. Of the three, the Bombay recension is believed to have preserved the oldest form of the Epic, for here we find a large number of archaic expressions which are rare in the Bengal and the West Indian recensions. According to Professor Jacobi, the Rāma-Epic was first composed in the Kośala country on the basis of the ballad poetry recited by the rhapsodists. In course of time there naturally arose differ-

ence in the tradition of the recitations made by professional story-tellers, and this difference inadequately explains the variations in the *three* recensions when they had been assuming their definite forms in the different parts of the land.

Internal evidence proves almost conclusively that the whole of the *Ramayana* as it is found to day was not written at one time. It is said that of the *seven* books in the *Ramayana*, the last one and portions of the first are interpolations. In the first place, there are numerous passages in the genuine books which either make no reference to the incidents in the first book or contain statements which contradict those to be found in the first book. Secondly, in the first and third cantos of the first book we find two tables of contents, the first of which does not mention the first and the seventh books. Thirdly, the style and language of the first book do not bear comparison with that of the five genuine books (II—VI). Fourthly, the frequent interruption of the narrative in the first and the seventh books and the complete absence of any such interruption in the other five books cannot but suggest that the two books were

Spurious element

composed by subsequent poets of less eminence and talent than the author of the genuine books. Lastly, the character of the hero as drawn in the first and the seventh books differs from what we find in the remaining books. Thus in those two books Rāma is not a mortal hero which he is in the other five books, but a divine being worthy of reverence to the nation.

It has been already observed that the original work of Vālmīki assumed different forms as with years rhapsodists introduced into it newer elements. It is, therefore, very difficult, if not absolutely impossible, to fix any specified age for the whole poem. Dr. Winteritz says that the transformation of Rāma from a man to the Universal God through a semi-divine national hero, cannot but take a sufficient length of time. It should be noted, however, that not only the Rāma-legend but the *Rāmāyana* of Vālmīki also was known to the *Mahābhārata* which contains the *Rāmopākhyāna* in the *Vana-parvan*, of course, in a condensed form. On the other hand, the poet or the poets of the *Rāmāyana* nowhere refer to the Bhāratan story. These facts have led scholars like Professor Jacobi to presume a very early

existence of the Rāma Epic¹ though it still remains a disputed point whether it was earlier than the original story of the *Mahābhārata* the passage in the *Vanaparva* containing the reference to the *Ramayana* being absent in that very early form of the Bharatī Epic Dr Winteritz believes that "if the *Mahābhārata* had on the whole its present form in the 4th Century A D the *Ramayana* must have received its final form at least a century or two earlier".

From a study of Jātakā literature it would appear that the stories of some of the Jātakas naturally remind us of the story of the *Ramayana* though it must be admitted that we seldom observe any literal agreement between the two. To cite an instance, the *Dasaratha jātaka* relates the story of the *Ramayana* in a different way where Rāma and Sītā are described as brother and sister. But it is highly significant that while the Jātakas give us innumerable stories of the demon world and the animals

Relation to
Buddhism

¹ Scholars like Jacobi Schlegel M Williams Jolly and others point out that the *Ramayana* is earlier than the *Mahābhārata* because the burning of widows does not occur in it but it is mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*.

they never mention the names of Rāvana and Hanumat and the monkeys. It is not, therefore, improbable that prior to the fourth or the third centuries B C , when the Buddhist *Tipitaka* is believed to have come into existence, the *Rāmāyana* in its Epic form was not available though ballads dealing with Rāma were known to exist Traces of Buddhism cannot be found in the *Rāmāyana* and the solitary instance where the Buddha is mentioned is believed to be an interpolation¹ Dr Weber, however, suggests that the *Rāmāyana* is based on an ancient Buddhist legend of Prince Rāma He thinks that the hero of the *Rāmāyana*, is essentially a sage in spirit and not merely a hero of war and that in Rāma we observe the glorification of the ideal of Buddhist equanimity Dr Winternitz also approves of the idea of explaining the extreme mildness and gentleness of Rāma by 'Buddhistic undercurrents' But we must say that by thinking in this way Dr Weber has ignored the fact that a poet like Vālmīki could easily draw his inspiration from his own heritage Our con-

¹ Lassen on Weber's *Rāmāyana* (IA Vol III)

clusion, therefore, is that there was no direct influence of Buddhism on the *Ramayana*

It is certain that there is no Greek influence on the *Ramayana* as the genuine *Ramayana* betrays no acquaintance with the Greeks Dr Weber, however, thinks that the *Ramayana* is based on the Greek legend of Helen and the Trojan war. But an examination of the contents of the *Ramayana* shows that the expression *yavana* occurs twice in the passages of the *Ramayana* which are evidently interpolations

Greek influence

Professor Lassen was the first scholar to give an allegorical interpretation of the *Ramayana*. In his opinion the Epic represented the first attempt of the Aryans to conquer Southern India. According to Dr Weber it was meant to account for the spread of Aryan civilization to South India and Ceylon

Allegorical interpretation of the Epic

Professor Jacobi gives us a mythological interpretation and says that there is no allegory in the Epic. Thus he points out that in the *Rgveda*, Sita appears as the field furrow and is involved as the goddess of agriculture. In some of the *Grhyasūtras* Sita is the genuine daughter of the plough field and is a wife of Purjanya or Indra. In

Mythological interpretation

the *Rāmāyana* also Sītā is represented as emerging from the plough-field of Janaka Rāma can be identified with India and Hanumat with the Mats, the associates of India in his battle with demons. But we would only add that to read allegory or mythology in a first rate work of art is without any justification.

REFERENCES

Davids, R Buddhist India
 Hopkins, E W The Great Epics of India
 Jacobi, H Das Rāmāyana
 Macdonell, A A A History of Sanskrit Literature
 Smith, V A Oxford History of India
 Weber, A (i) On the Rāmāyana (IA Vol III)
 (ii) The History of Indian Literature
 Williams, M Indian Wisdom
 Winternitz, M A History of Indian Literature,
 Vol I

B

MAHĀBHĀRATA

Dr Winternitz describes the *Mahabharata* as a whole literature and does not look upon it as one poetic production which the *Ramayana* essentially is. The nucleus of the *Mahabharata* is the great war of eighteen days fought between the Kauravas the hundred sons of Dhrtarastra and the Pandavas the five sons of Pandu. The poet narrates all the circumstances leading up to the war. In this great Kuruksetra battle were involved almost all the kings of India joining either of the two parties. The result of this war was the total annihilation of the Kauravas and their party, and Yudhishthira the head of the Pandavas, became the sovereign monarch of Hastināpura. But with the progress of years new matters and episodes relating to the various aspects of human life, social economic, political, moral and religious as also fragments of other heroic legends and legends containing reference to famous kings, came to be added to the aforesaid nucleus and this phenomenon probably continued for centuries till in the early part of the Christian era the Epic gathered its present shape which is said

General
character
and story

to contain a hundred thousand verses. It is, therefore, that the *Mahābhārata* has been described not only as a heroic poem, but also as a 'repository of the whole of the bard poetry'. The Epic in its present form is divided into eighteen books with a supplement called the *Harivamśa*¹.

The famous *Śrīmad-Bhagavadgītā* is a chapter of the *Bhīṣmaparvan* and contains eighteen sections. The *Gītā* is a simplification in verse of the crude doctrines in Hindu philosophy and is a book specially meant for the dwellers of the society rather than for one who has renounced it. The book is no doubt one of the finest fruits of Indian philosophy and has gained world-wide recognition in the hands of philosophers. The theme of this book is the advice, given by Śrī-Kṛṣṇa for consoling depressed Arjuna, mainly dwelling on the doctrines of *karma*, *jñāna* and *bhakti*.

It is extremely difficult for us to separate at this distant date the chaff from the real. However, in the first book of the *Mahābhārata* there is a statement that at one time

¹ It is not definitely known whether this division into eighteen books is purely traditional, there being a somewhat different form of division as surmised from the writings of Albērūnī.

the Epic contained 24000 verses while in another context we find that it consisted of 8800 verses These statements may definitely lead one to conclude that the Epic had undergone *three* principal stages of development before it assumed its present form

It is impossible to give in one line the exact date of the *Mahabharata* To determine the date of the *Mahabharata* we should determine the date of every part of this Epic In the *Vedas* there is no mention of the incident of the great Kuruksetra battle In the *Brāhmaṇas*, however, the holy Kuru field is described as a place of pilgrimage where gods and mortals celebrated big sacrificial feasts We also find the names of *Janamejaya* and *Bhrītu* in the *Brāhmaṇas* So also the name of *Pariksit* is a ruler of Kuru land is found in the *Atharvāveda* We find frequent mention of the *Kurus* and the *Pañcālas* in the *Yajurveda* The *Kathala samhita* mentions the name of *Dhṛitarāṣṭra*, son of *Vicitravīrya* In the *Saṅkhayana Gāutasutra* we find the mention of a war in Kuru land which was fatal for the *Kauravas* But the names of the *Pandavas* do not occur therein The *Gīhyasutra* of *Āśvalayana* gives the names of *Bharata* and

Age of the
Epic

Mahābhārata in a list of teachers and books Pāṇini gives us the derivation of the words Yudhīṣṭhīra, Bhīma and Vidūha and the accent of the compound *Mahābhārata*. Patañjali is the first to make definite allusions to the story of the battle between the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas. Although the Buddhist *Tripitaka* does not mention the name of the *Mahābhārata*, the Jātakas betray a slight acquaintance with it.

Moreover, it is proved by literary and inscriptive evidence that already about 500 A.D., the *Mahābhārata* was no longer an actual Epic but a sacred book and a religious discourse. It was on the whole essentially different from the Epic as it is found to-day. Kumārīlabhatta quotes passages from the *Mahābhārata* and regards it as a Smṛti work. Both Subandhu and Bāna knew it as a great work of art¹ and Bāna alludes to a recital of the *Mahābhārata*². It must be admitted on all hands that though an Epic *Mahābhārata* did not exist in the time of the Vedas, single myths, legends and poems included in the *Mahābhārata* reach back to the Vedic period. The *Mahābhārata* has also

Literary
and inscrip-
tional
evidence

¹ *Vās* p. 37 & *Har* p. 2

² *Kād* p. 104

drawn many moral narratives and stories of saints from its contemporary 'ascetic poetry'. An Epic *Mahabharata*, however, did not exist in the fourth century B.C., and the transformation of the Epic *Mahabharata* into our present compilation probably took place between the fourth century B.C. and the fourth century A.D. In the fourth century A.D., the work was available in its present extent, contents and character, though small alterations and additions might have continued even in later centuries.

To the strictly orthodox Indian mind, the *Ramayana* appears to have been composed earlier than the *Mahabharata*. Indians believe that of the two incarnations of the Lord, Rāma and Kṛṣṇa, the former was born earlier. Western critics do not attach any importance to this belief, for it is argued by them that the hero of the genuine portion of the *Ramayana* which is older does not appear as an incarnation but as an ordinary mortal hero.¹ Professor Jacobi

Two Epics
which is
earlier?

¹ There are a few passages in the genuine books e.g. the one in Bk. VI where Sītā enters into the pyre wherein Rāma is described as a divine being. Critics feel no hesitation in calling such passages interpolations.

also thinks that of the two poems, the *Rāmāyana* is the earlier production, and he bases his theory on the supposition that it is the influence of the *Rāmāyana* which has moulded the *Mahābhārata* into a poetic form¹ Dr. Winteritz does not attach any real importance to this theory and criticizes it by saying that the *Mahābhārata*, even in its present form, retains several characteristics of older poetry while the poem of Vālmīki reveals such peculiarities as would place him nearer to the age of Court-epics. Thus it has been pointed out that such expressions like "Bhīma spake" "Sañjaya spake" which the poet of the *Mahābhārata*, uses to introduce a character, are reminiscent of ancient ballad poetry² But in the *Rāmāyana* the speeches are introduced in verses and therefore in a more polished form. The theory of Professor Jacobi may be further contested on the ground that

¹ According to Mr. Hopkins, the *Rāmāyana* as an art-product is later than the *Mahābhārata* (Cf. Cambridge History, I p. 251)

² The mixture of prose with poetry which we notice in the *Mahābhārata* is a fact that proves its antiquity. This view of Professor Oldenberg is not accepted by Dr. Winteritz

from a perusal of the two Epics, the reader will unmistakably carry the impression that while the *Mahabharata* describes a more warlike age the *Ramayana* depicts a comparatively refined civilization

REFERENCES

Bhandarkar R G On the *Mahābhārata* (IA
Vol I)

Goldstucker T The *Mahābhārata*

Hopkins E W The Great Epics of India

Macdonell A A A History of Sanskrit Literature

Telang K T SBE Vol VIII

Vaidya C V *Mahābhārata* a critical study

Weber A The History of Indian Literature

Williams M Indian Wisdom

Winternitz M A History of Indian Literature
Vol I

CHAPTER TWO

THE PURĀNAS

The origin of the Purānas must be traced to that time of religious revolution when Buddhism was gaining ground as a formidable foe of Brāhmanic culture. Great devotees of Brāhmanic religion were anxious for the preservation of the old relics of Hindu culture, and Vyāsa, the great compiler, the greatest man of his time, was born to meet the demand of the age. The most important point to be remembered in this connection, is that the entire Vedic culture lies at the back-ground of the age of Buddhism and the Purānas.

Introduc-
tion

Age

It was at one time believed by European scholars that not one of the *eighteen* Purānas is earlier than the eleventh century A D. But this belief has been discarded on the discovery of a manuscript of the *Shandapuri-āna* in Nepal written in the sixth century A D. Further, Bānabhatta in his *Hari-śa-carita* mentions that he once attended a recitation of the *Vāyupuri-āna*. Kumārila (750 A D) regards the Purānas as the sources of law. Śanka (ninth century A D) and Rāmānuja (eleventh century A D) refer to the Purānas

as sacred texts for their dependence on the Vedas. The famous traveller Alberūnī (1030 A.D.) also gives us a list of the eighteen Purānas.

The word Purāna means 'old narrative'. In the Brāhmaṇas, the Upaniṣads and the Buddhist texts, the word is found to be used in connection with Itihāsa. Some scholars hold that the Purānas mentioned in these places do not refer to the works we have before us. But the references found in the *Dharmasutras* of Guṇatama and Āpastamba (works belonging in all probability to the fifth or the fourth century B.C.) suggest that there were at that early period works resembling our Purānas. The close relationship between the *Mahabharata* and the Purānas is another point in support of the antiquity of the latter. The *Mahabharata* which calls itself a Purāna, has the general character of the latter, and it is not highly improbable that some integral parts of the Purānas are older than the present redaction of the *Mahabharata*. The *Lalitavistara* not only calls itself a Purāna but has also much in common with the Purānas. The *Vayupurāna* is quoted literally by the *Harivamśa*. The genealogical survey of all the Purānas reveals

Antiquity

the fact that they generally stop with the accounts of the Añdhia Bhrtya and Gupta kings and that later kings like Haisa are not mentioned. So it may be suggested that the Purāṇas were written during the rule of the Gupta kings. On the other hand, the striking resemblance between the Buddhist Mahāyāna texts of the first century A.D., and the Purāṇas, suggests the fact that the latter were written early in the beginnings of the Christian era. The characteristics of the Purāṇas are also found in books like the *Saddharmapundarīka* and the *Mahāvastu*. Di Winteritz has, however, concluded that the earlier Purāṇas must have come into being before the seventh century A.D.

Character

According to Indian tradition every Purāṇa should discuss *five* topics, - (i) *sāṅga* creation, (ii) *pratिसंगा* the periodical annihilation and renewal of the world, (iii) *vamśa* genealogy of gods and sages, (iv) *manvantara* the Manu-periods of time i.e., the great periods each of which has a Manu (primal ancestor of the human race) as its ruler, and (v) *vamśānicarita* the history of the dynasties the origin of which is traced to the Sun and the Moon. But all these *five* characteristics are not present in

every Purāna, and though in some they are partially present, we notice a wide diversity of topics in them. Thus we find many chapters dealing with the duties of the four castes and of the four *avācas*, sections on Brāhmaṇical rites, on particular ceremonies and feasts and frequently also chapters on Sāṅkhyā and Yōga philosophy. But the most striking peculiarity of all the Purānas is their sectarian character as they are dedicated to the cult of some deity who is treated as the principal God in the book. So we come across a Purāna dedicated to Viṣṇu another to Śiva and so on.

Unique is the importance of the Purānas from the standpoint of history and religion. The genealogical survey of the Purānas is immensely helpful for the study of political history in ancient India, and yet it is a task for the scholar to glean germs of Indian history, hidden in the Purānas. Dr Smith says that the *Viṣṇupurāna* gives us invaluable informations about the Mauryā dynasty. The *Matsyapurāna* is most dependable in so far as the Andhra dynasty is concerned, while the *Vayupurāna* gives us detailed descriptions about the reign of Candragupta I. As the object of the Purānas was to popularize

Value

the more difficult and highly philosophical preaching of the Vedas through the medium of historical facts and tales, we naturally find in them Hinduism in a fully developed form. So the student of religion cannot pass it by. The Purāṇas are not also wanting in literary merit, and they abound in numerous passages which speak of the highly artistic talent of their makers.

The Purāṇas or the Mahā-purāṇas, as we have them to-day, are *eighteen* in number, and there are also minor Purāṇas (Upa-purāṇas) which all again number *eighteen*. The *eighteen* Mahā-purāṇas are

- (1) *Brahma*, (2) *Padma*, (3) *Viṣṇu*,
- (4) *Śiva*, (5) *Bhāgavata*, (6) *Nārada*,
- (7) *Mārkaṇḍeya*, (8) *Agni*, (9) *Bhavīṣya* or *Bhavīṣyat*, (10) *Brahmavavarta*, (11) *Linga*,
- (12) *Vaiśha*, (13) *Shanda*, (14) *Vāmana*,
- (15) *Kūma*, (16) *Matsya*, (17) *Gariuda* and (18) *Brahmānda*

The *Devīmāhātmya* which is popularly known as the '*Candī*' or the '*Saptasati*', is a section of the *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa*. According to Dr. Winternitz, its date is not later than the sixth century A.D. The book which contains *thirteen* chapters and *seven hundred* mantras, is a glorification of the *Primal*

Name and number

Devīmāhātmya

Indra (the *Shatru*) who descends among all other *Devas* from time to time to rid the worlds of their *pratighara* and kill them in the power of the demon. Madhu (killed by *Manu*) is Sumbha and Nisumbha are other. The better role *Indra* is a religious function of the Hindu.

The eighteen *Utpatthi* puravas which have been told by different *muni* are —

(1) *Sitallamata* (2) *Narayana* (3) *Laya* (4) *Sri Bhumi* (5) *Bhuma* (6) *Nirvada* (7) the two *Nandikavadas* (8) *Umas* (9) *Kapali* (10) *Varuna* (11) *Sambu* (12) *Kuhu* (13) *Malecchita* (14) *Halli* (15) *Dai* (16) *Pisusita* (17) *Uttara* and (18) *Phulada* or *Surya*¹

in a
series of
Utpa-
tthi

REFERENCES

Bhanja Ray B. G. — Aspects of the Early History of India. *BBPAS* V 1-33 (1967)

Farmer E. J. — *IEI* V 1-3, 1958

Ferguson E. J. — *Cambridge History* V 1-1

Wilcock H. H. — Essays on Sanskrit Literature

Winternitz M. — *A History of Indian Literature* Vol. I

¹ The above list of *Utpatthi* puravas given by Bhanja Ray is taken from the *Satititipravara* 3. But *Halita* gives a different list.

CHAPTER THREE

THE TANTRAS

The expression Tantia which is a generic name for works belonging to 'Āgama', 'Tantia' and 'Samhitā', refers to theological treatises discussing the codes of discipline and worship among different sects of religion along with their metaphysical and mystical points of view. A complete Tantia generally consists of four parts, the themes treated of being (i) knowledge (*jñāna*), (ii) meditation (*yoga*), (iii) action (*kriyā*) and (iv) conduct (*caryā*). Though it is not possible to draw any special line of demarcation among Āgama, Tantia and Samhitā, still it is usual to refer to the sacred books of the Śaivas by the expression Āgama, while Tantia stands for the sacred literature of the Śāktas and Samhitā for that of the Vaiṣnavas. The Śākta-Tantras are mainly monistic in character, while the Vaiṣnava-Tantras generally advocate dualism, or qualified monism. The Śaiva-Tantras are divided into three schools of monism, qualified monism and dualism.

The Tantras came to replace the Vedas

when in later times it was found that performance of a sacrifice according to Vedic rites was practically impossible owing to their rigid orthodoxy. Thus the Tantras provide easier and less complicated methods which would suit not only the higher classes but also the Sūdras and the feminine folk of the society who had no access to Vedic ceremonies. It would therefore not be wise to think that Tantric literature is opposed to Vedic literature, and this point would be made abundantly clear when it is found that the rigidly orthodox Vedic scholars write original works and commentaries on Tantras.

The earliest manuscripts of Tantras date from the seventh to the ninth century A.D., and it is probable that the literature dates back to the fifth or the sixth century A.D., if not earlier. We do not find any reference to a Tantra in the *Mahabharata*. The Chinese pilgrims also do not mention it. It is indeed certain that Tantric doctrine penetrated into Buddhism in the seventh and eighth centuries A.D. The worship of Durga may be traced back even to the Vedic period.

The home of Āgamic literature seems to be Kashmir, while that of Tantric literature is Bengal. Sāmhitā literature

Relation to
Vedic
literature

Antiquity

Home

as it is known, originated in different parts of India, in Bengal, South India and the Siamese country

Among works belonging to Āgamic literature of Kāshmīr the most important are the following

Mālinīvijaya, *Svacchanda*, *Vijñānabharava*, *Ucchusmabharava*, *Ānandabharava*, *Migendra*, *Matanga*, *Netra*, *Nairāṭa*, *Srāvayambhūta* and *Rudrāyāmala*

Closely associated with Āgamic literature is Piātyabhijñā literature. Some of the most important works of this literature are .

Śradhī of Somānanda (850-900 A.D) *Piātyabhijñākārikā* of Utpala (900-950 A.D) *Mālinīvijayottarārāttika*, *Piātyabhijñāvimanśī*, *Tantrāloka*, *Tantrāśāra* and *Paramārthasāra* of Abhimavagupta (993-1015 A.D) and *Piātyabhijñāhīdaya* of Ksemārāja (pupil of Abhimavagupta)

Among works belonging to Samhitā literature the most important is the *Ahu-budhnyasamhitā* which was composed in Kāshmīr in the fifth century A.D *Īśvara-samhitā*, *Pauṣkariasamhitā*, *Pāṇamasamhitā*, *Sāttvatasamhitā*, *Bṛihadbrāhmaṇasamhitā* and *Jñānāmrtaśārasamhitā* are other well-known works of this branch of Sanskrit literature

Works on
Āgama

Works on
Piātya-
bhijñā

Works on
Samhitā

Among works belonging to Tantra literature, mention may be made of the following —

Mahānirvana, *Kularnava*, *Kulacudamani*, *Prapāñcasara* (of Sankuva), *Tantrāraja*, *Kōlivilasa*, *Jñanarnava*, *Saradatilaka*, *Varnasyārahasya* (of Bhaskara), *Tantrasara* (of Kṛṣṇananda) and *Pranatosmī*

Works on Tantra

REFERENCES

Avalon A Tantrik Texts

Chatterji J C Kashmir Shaivism

Winteritz M A History of Indian Literature
Vol I

CHAPTER FOUR

KĀVYĀ IN INSCRIPTIONS

Renaissance theory

Early in the beginnings of Sanskritic studies in Europe, Professor Max Müller propounded the theory of the 'Renaissance of Sanskrit literature, which remained highly popular for a considerable length of time. This theory, set forth with much profundity, sought to establish that Brāhmanic culture passed through its dark age at the time when India was continuously facing foreign invasions. The earliest revival of this culture is to be found in the reign of the Guptas which is a golden page in the annals of Indian culture. In spite of all its ingenuity the theory has been generally discredited by recent researches and discovery. Evidences are now at our disposal to prove the falsity of the assumption and the inscriptions of the early centuries of the Christian era unmistakably show that the study and development of Sanskrit Kāvya was never impeded.

Girnār inscription

Thus the inscription of Rudradāman at Girnār dated 150 A.D., is written in prose in the full-fledged Kāvya style with conformity to the rules of grammar.

Though traces of epic licence can be found in the inscription, still the writer is a gifted master in the use of figures of speech. As an example of alliteration may be cited the phrase *abhyastanumno Rudradamno*. Though there are long compounds still the clearness and the lucidity of the style is nowhere forsaken. What is more significant is that the author is conversant with the science of poetics and discusses the merits attributed by Dandin to the *Vidarbha* style.

Still another inscription which is derivable from a record of Sri Pulumayi at Nasik is written in Prakrit prose. The date of this inscription is not far removed from the former. The author who is undoubtedly familiar with Sanskrit, uses enormous sentences with long compounds. Alliterations and even mannerisms of later Kāvya's are found in this inscription.

Nasik
inscription

It may be therefore concluded that the works of Asvaghosa, the great Buddhist poet, are not the earliest specimens of Sanskrit Kāvya. Either these earlier Kāvyas are now lost to us unfortunately, or authors like Kalidasa have completely eclipsed the glory of their predecessors. Thus of the three

Conclu-
sions

dramatists referred to by Kālidāsa, the dramas of only one are now known to us

REFERENCES

Keith, A. B. A History of Sanskrit Literature
Macdonell, A. A. A History of Sanskrit Literature
Müller, Max. A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature

CHAPTER FIVE

EARLY BUDDHIST WORKS IN SANSKRIT

The paucity of authentic landmarks in the domain of early Indian history is a stupendous stumbling block to the gateway to the study of the history of Sanskrit literature. A colossal darkness that envelops the period of Sanskrit literature in the beginnings of the Christian era, makes it extremely difficult if not hopelessly impossible, to ascertain the age in which a particular writer lived and wrote his work. The chronology of Indian literature is shrouded in such painful obscurity that oriental scholars were long ignorant of the vast literature produced in Sanskrit, by Buddhist writers.

The thought of the Mahayana school of Buddhism was expressed in a language which was not Pali, the extraordinarily rich and extensive religious literature of Ceylon and Burma, but which was partly Sanskrit and partly a dialect to which Professor Senart has given the designation Mid Sanskrit, or which Professor Pischel likes to call the Gatha.

Introduction

Buddhist
Sanskrit
literature
includes
Mahayana
and Hinayana
works

dialect¹ This literature of the Mahāyāna school is called Buddhist Sanskrit literature. But it should be mentioned in this connection that Buddhist Sanskrit literature is not synonymous with the rich literature of the Mahāyāna school alone, but it has a still wider scope including as it does the literature of the Hinayāna school as well, inasmuch as the Saṃvāstivādins, a sect of the Hinayāna school, possess a canon and a fairly vast literature in Sanskrit. The Sanskrit canon, however, is not available in its entirety, but its existence is proved on the evidence of the several quotations from it in such works as the *Mahāvastu*, the *Divyāvadāna* and the *Lalitavistara*. This Sanskrit canon shows close affinity to the Pāli canon, and it is suggested that both of them are but translations of some original canon in Māgadhi, which is lost to us.

The most important work of the Hinayāna school is the *Mahāvastu*, the book of the Great Events. This *Mahāvastu*, a book belonging to the school of the Loko-

Mahāvastu
its date

¹ It may be observed in this connection that the Nāsik Cave inscription No. X of Nahapāna is written in this dialect.

ttuāvadins a sub division of the Mahasan
ghikas, shows after the introduction the fol
lowing title *Āyamahasanghīlānam Loko
ttarāvadinam madhyadeśīlānam pathena
nayapitalasya mahavastu adi* This may fur
nish us with a clue to determine the date of
its composition In order to ascertain this
it is to be found out when the Loko
ttuāvādin sect of the Mahasanghikas sprung
up In this connexion, it would be necessary
to fix the date of Buddha's death Scholars
are divided in their opinions as to the
exact year when Buddha died Professors
Max Muller and Cunningham make it 477
B.C. while Mr Gopala Aiyer likes to fix it at
483 B.C. But more probable is Dr Smith's
theory according to which Buddha died in
487 B.C. It is said that Asoka was coronated
in 269 B.C. and that this coronation took place
some two hundred and eighteen years after
the death of Buddha But if the account of the
Southern Buddhists is to be believed this
year was either 544 or 543 B.C. Now the open
ing lines of the fifth chapter of the *Mahavamsa*
will throw light on the age when the Maha
sāṅghikas came into being¹ There it is

¹ Eko va theravādo so ṭdivassasate ahu | aññī

stated that during the first century after the death of Buddha, there was but one schism among the Theras. Subsequent to this period, other schisms took place among the preceptors. From the whole of those sinful priests, in number ten thousand, who had been degraded by the Theras (who had held the second convocation) originated the schism among the preceptors called the *Mahāsāṅghika* heresy. It is described in this connexion that as many as eighteen schisms rose and all of them in the course of a couple of centuries after the death of Buddha. But, the difficulty is that there is no mention of the *Lokottaravādins* in the *Mahāvamsa*. In the appendix of the translation of the *Mahāvamsa*, it has been said that the *Lokottaravādins* do not appear in the tradition of the Southern Buddhists. They are mentioned immediately beside the *Gokulikas*. In Rock hill 182, the *Lokottaravādins* are to be found

caṇṇiyavādā tu tato oram ajāyisum || Tehi sangītikā-
rehi theiehi dutiyehi te | niggahitā pāpabhikkhū sabbe
dasasahassikā || Akams'ācaṇṇiyavādām *Mahāsāṅghika-*
nāmakam ||

just in the place where the Gokulikas are expected. Moreover, in two other contexts the Gokulikas and not the Lokottaravādins are mentioned. Thus, it is better to identify the two and in that case, the Lokottaravādins seem to have sprung up at least in the third century B.C. That being so, the *Mahāastu* which has been described to be the first work of that sect, could not have been written later than that period.

But a fresh difficulty makes its appearance. The *Mahāastu* is not a composite whole. Different parts of it have been composed at different periods and this accounts for the unmethodical arrangement of facts and ideas in the work. Besides, the *Mahāastu* is not a piece of artistic literature. It has rightly been called 'a labyrinth in which we can only with an effort, discover the thread of a coherent account of the life of Buddha'. The contents are not in the least properly arranged and the reader may come across the repetition of the same story, over and over again. But the importance of the work can never be undervalued in view of the fact that it has preserved numerous traditions of respectable antiquity and versions of texts occurring in the Pali canon.

Mahāastu
its charac-
ter

The *Mahāvastu* has yet another claim to its importance, for in it the reader discovers a storehouse of stories. It is a truth that nearly half of the book is devoted to Jātakas and stories of like nature. Most of the narratives remind us of the stories of Purāṇas and the history of Brahmadatta may be cited as an instance. To conclude, the *Mahāvastu*, though a work of the Hinayāna school, betrays some affinity to the Mahāyānistic thought. The mention of a number of Buddhas and the conception of Buddha's self-begottenness, are ideas associated with the Mahāyāna school.

The literature of the Mahāyāna school of Buddhism is extremely rich. Though originally a work of the Saivismādin school attached to the Hinayāna, the *Lalitavistara* is believed to be one of the most sacred Mahāyāna texts, inasmuch as it is regarded as a *Vaipulyasūtra*. That the work contains the Mahāyānistic faith may easily be inferred from the very title of the work which means 'the exhaustive narrative of the sport of the Buddha'. A critical study of the work reveals, however, that it is but a redaction of an older Hinayāna text expanded and embellished in the sense of

the *Mahāvīra* a biography of the Buddha representing the Sarvastivādin school. It is also a fact that the present *Latitavistara* is not the work of a single author it is rather 'an anonymous compilation in which both the old and the young fragments have found their places. Such being the case it is hardly proper to regard the work as a good old source for the knowledge of Buddhism. The reader finds in it the gradual development of the Buddha legend in its earliest beginnings. Hence there is hardly any significance in the statement of Professor Vallee Poussin when he says that the *Latitavistara* represents the popular Buddhism. The book however is of great importance from the standpoint of literary history inasmuch as it has supplied materials for the monumental epic of Asvaghosa entitled the *Buddhacarita*.

To determine the date of composition of the work it would be necessary to bear in mind that the work is a *Vaipulyasūtra*. In the *Vaipulyasūtras* we find sections in a redaction of prose followed by one in verse, the latter being in substance, only a repetition of the former. The idiom of prose portions is a kind of Sanskrit while that of

Date of
Latitavistara
Kern's
view

verses, Gāthās, a veiled Prākrit somewhat clumsily Sanskritized as much as the exigencies of the metre have permitted. Professor Kern thinks that the prose passages are undoubtedly translations of a Prākrit text into Sanskrit. The question, therefore, arises why and when has the original idiom been replaced by Sanskrit? It is known that in India it has been the common fate of all Prākrits that they have become obsolete whilst the study and practice of Sanskrit have been kept up all over the country as the common language of science and literature, and also as a bond between Aryans and Dravidians. Now it may be asked, at what time then might Sanskrit have reconquered its ascendancy? Professor Kern suggests that it was in all probability shortly before or after the council in the reign of that great Indo-Scythian King Kaniska.

Nariman's
view and
conclusions

M. G. K. Nariman, in his Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism, says that it is an erroneous conception that the *Lalitavistara* was translated into Chinese in the first Christian era. Moreover, he doubts that the Chinese biography of Buddha, called the Phuyau-king, published in 300 A.D., is the second translation of our present text of the

Lalitavistara On the other hand, he says that a precise rendering of the Sanskrit text was completed in Tibetan and it was produced as late as the fifth century A.D. It may however, be noted here that Professor Kein has taken sufficient pains to prove that there is much that is of respectable antiquity in the work. Taking this factor into consideration its date may be assigned some time before the Christian era.

The most outstanding Buddhist writer in Sanskrit is Asvaghosa. Round his date hangs a veil of mystery. Dr. Smith writes in his History of India. In literature the memory of Kaniska is associated with the names of the eminent Buddhist writers Nāgārjuna, Asvaghosa, and Vasumitra. Asvaghosa is described as having been a poet, musician, scholar, religious controversialist and zealous Buddhist monk orthodox in creed and a strict observer of discipline. Judged from all evidences it may be concluded that Kaniska flourished in 78 A.D. Hence Asvaghosa who adorned his court, flourished in the first century of the Christian era.¹

Asvaghosa
his date

¹ In the chronological group generally accepted by numismatics the Kaniska group succeeds the Kadphisi

The masterpiece of Asvaghosa is his *Buddhacarita* the life-history of Buddha. From the account of I-tsing it appears that the *Buddhacarita* with which he was acquainted, consisted of twenty-eight cantos. The *Buddhacarita* of Asvaghosa group. But even this view has not the unanimous support of scholars. If, as some scholars hold, the group of kings comprising Kaniska, Vasiska, Huviska and Vasudeva preceded Kadphises I, the coins of the two princes last named should be found together, as they are not, and those of Kadphises II and Kaniska should not be associated, as they are. Chief supporters of the view stated above are Dil Fleet, Frank and M. Kennedy. Dil Fleet lays stress on the fact that Chinese historians as apart from Buddhist authors make no mention of Kaniska. But he himself answers the question when he holds that with the year 125 A.D., the source was dried up from which the chronicler could draw the information regarding the peoples of Turkestan. Dil Fleet connects Kaniska's accession to the throne with the traditional Vikrama Samvat, beginning with the year 57 B.C. This view has been ably controverted by Dil Thomas and discoveries of Professor Marshall totally belie its truth. Inscriptions, coins and the records of Hiuen Tsang point out that Kaniska's dominion included Gandhāra. According to Chinese evidence, Kipin or Kāpiśa-Gandhāra was not under the Kusāna kings in the second half of the first century B.C. Professors Marshall, Sten Konow, Smith and other scholars think that Kaniska's rule begins about 125 A.D. The evidence of Sue Vihārī

Tibetan translation, too, contains the same number of cantos. But unluckily the Sanskrit text comprises *seventeen* cantos only, of which, again, the last four are of dubious origin. It is said that one Amṛtānandī of

inscriptions proves that Kanishka's empire extended as far as the Lower Indus valley but the Junīgadh inscription of Rudradīman tells us that the dominions of the Emperor included Sindhu and Sauvira. It is known that Rudradīman lived from A.D. 130 to A.D. 150. Under the circumstances it is almost impossible to reconcile the suzerainty of the Kuśa King with the independence of this powerful satrap (cf. *Shayama dhigatam mahīkṣatrapanūma*). From Kanishka's dates 3—23, Viśiṣṭaka's dates 24—28, Huviṣka's dates 31—60 and Viśudeva's dates 74—98 it is almost evident that Kanishka was the originator of an era. But according to our evidence no new era was in vogue about the beginning of the second century A.D. Dr R. C. Mazumdar is of opinion that the era started by Kanishka was the Kalachuri era of 248-49 A.D. But Professor Jouveau Dubreuil contends that it is not likely that Viśudeva's reign terminated after 100 years from Kanishka's date of accession for Mathurā where Viśudeva reigned came under the Nandas about 350 A.D. It may be further mentioned that for the reason stated above we can hardly accept the theory of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar who accepts A.D. 278 as the date of Kanishka's accession. According to Professors Ferguson, Oldenberg, Thomas, R. D. Banerjee, Rapson and others Kanishka started the Saka era commencing from 78 A.D.

the ninth century A.D. added these four cantos. Even the manuscript discovered by MM. Haüpriasāda Śāstrikā, reaches down to the middle of the fourteenth canto.

Professor Dubreuil does not accept the view as well on the following grounds. First, if the view that Kujula-kaia-Kadphises and Hermaios reigned about 50 A.D. and that Kaniska founded the era in 78 A.D. is accepted, there remain only *twenty-eight* years for the end of the reign of Kadphises I and the entire reign of Kadphises II. But Kadphises II succeeded an octogenarian and it is not impossible that his reign was one of short duration. Professor Marshall says that Professor Dubreuil has discovered at Taxila a document which can be placed in 79 A.D. and the king, it mentions, was certainly not Kaniska. But Professor H. C. Ray Chaudhuri has shown that the title Devaputra was applicable to the Kaniska group and not to the earlier group. The omission of a personal name does not prove that the first Kusāna king was meant. Secondly, Professor Dubreuil says that Professor Sten Konow has shown that Tibetan and Chinese documents prove that Kaniska lived in the second century A.D. But it is not improbable that this Kaniska is the Kaniska of the Āśā inscription of the year 41 which, if referred to the Śaka era, would give a date that would fall in the second century A.D. Po-t'iao may be one of the successors of Vāsudeva I. Professors Banejee and Smith recognize the existence of more than one Vāsudeva. Finally, Professor Konow has shown that inscriptions of the Kaniska era and the Śaka era are not dated in

The *Buddhacarita* is really a work of art. Unlike the *Mahavastu* and the *Lalitavistara*, it shows a systematic treatment of the subject matter. Nowhere will the reader come across a confused or incoherent description. Throughout the work, the poet is very cautious about the use of figures of speech, and this abstinence from the super abundant employment of figures of speech has lent special charm to the merit of the work. Over and above this, the presentation of the miraculous in the Buddha legend has been done with equal moderation. Thus, in short, the work is an artistic creation. An account of the assemblage of fair and young ladies watching from gabled windows of high mansions, the exit of the royal prince from the capital is followed by a vivid life like description of how he came in contact with the hateful spectacle of senility. The

A crit
appreci
tion

the same manner. The learned scholar shows that the inscriptions of Kaniska are dated in different fashions. In the Kharosthi inscriptions Kaniska follows the method of his Saka Pallava predecessors. On the other hand in the Brāhmī inscriptions he follows the ancient Indian method. Is it then impossible that he adopted a third method to suit the local conditions in Western India?

ladies, when they came to know that the prince was going out of the city, rushed to the window, careless of girdles falling off from their bodies and the poet speaks of their faces as so many full-blown lotuses with which the palace was decorated. The poet shows high artistic craftsmanship in depicting how the prince overcame the lures of sweet ladies who made an attempt to divert his mind from the desire to bid good-bye to all the joys and comforts of the world and also in the description of the famous scene in which the prince, gazing on the undressed bodies of the ladies, locked in the sweet embrace of sleep, resolved to abandon the palace. No less artistically pathetic is the scene in which the prince takes leave of his charioteer and the conversation between the two is remarkable for the spirit of absolute disinterestedness towards worldly happiness, which is displayed by the prince. The poet is also an adept in the description of battles, and no one will forget the spirited picture of the contest of Buddha against the demon Māra and his monstrous hosts. Evidences are also discernible in the work to show that the poet was familiar with the doctrine of statecraft.

Asvaghosa is the author of another epic, the *Saundarananda*, which has been discovered and edited by MM Haraprasāda Sastrin. This work also turns round the history of Buddha's life, but the central theme is the history of the reciprocal love of Sundaṇi and Nanda, the half brother of Buddha, who is initiated into the order against his will by the latter.

Saundara
nanda

The third work of the poet is a lyrical poem, the *Gandistotriagatha*, reconstructed in the Sanskrit original from the Chinese by A von Stael Holstein.

Gandist
otriagatha

Another work of the poet is the *Sutralanlara*,¹ which undoubtedly is a later production than the *Buddhacarita*, inasmuch as the former quotes the latter. It is to be regretted that the Sanskrit original is not yet available, what we have is only the Chinese translation of the work. This *Sutralanlara* is a collection of pious legends after the model of Jatakas and Avadānas. This work however, has furnished us with a clue to the existence of dramatic

Sutralan
lara

¹ Dr Winternitz is of opinion that this work was written by Kumāralāta a junior contemporary of Asvaghosa. The work bears the title *Kalpanūma nūḍikā* or *Kalpanālankṛtikā*.

literature even at the time Aśvaghosa In the piece relating to Māra we have the recapitulation of a drama

There is a positive evidence to show that Aśvaghosa was a dramatist as well and in this connection reference may be made to the momentous discovery of the concluding portion of a *nine-act* drama entitled the *Sāriputraprakarana* which treats of the conversion of Sāriputra and his friend Maudgalyāyana Among the valuable manuscript treasures in palm-leaf recovered from Turfan there is a fragmentary manuscript in which Professor Lüders found this drama which bore the name of Aśvaghosa as its author

One more work attributed to the poet is the *Mahāyānaśraddhotpādasūtra*, a philosophical treatise on the basis of the Mahāyāna doctrine.¹ Herein, as Professor Lévi remarks, the author shows himself as a profound metaphysician, as an intrepid reviver of a doctrine which was intended to regenerate Buddhism It is believed that the author came of a Brāhmaṇa family and that he was later initiated into the doctrine of Buddhism

¹ According to Dr. Winternitz this work has been wrongly ascribed to Aśvaghosa

At first, he joined the Sarvāstivādin school and then prepared for the Mahāyāna. It was at one time believed that Asvaghosa was a pioneer in the field of Mahāyānism but it is better to suppose that he was not the first to write a treatise on that subject, but was a strong exponent of it. For, it is undeniable that the Mahāyāna school developed long before Asvaghosa.

Another work attributed to Asvaghosa, is the *Vajrasuci*. Here the author takes up the Brāhmaṇic standpoint and disputes the authority of sacred texts and the claims of caste, and advocates the doctrine of equality. In the Chinese *Tripitaka* Catalogue the work has been ascribed to Dharmalīrti.¹

Mātrceta is the mystical name of a Buddhist Sanskrit poet who according to the Tibetan historian Farīnithī, is none other than Asvaghosa. According to I tsing Mātrceta is the author of the *Catussata Jastotra* and the *Satapancasatīlānumastotra*, two poems in four hundred and one hundred and fifty verses respectively. Fragments of the Sanskrit original of the former have been discovered in Central Asia.

Vajrasuci

Mātrceta
his works

¹ Vide Bunyiu Nanjo Catalogue of the Chinese Translation of the Buddhist *Tripitaka* No 1303

The poems show some artistic excellence. Another work attributed to him is the *Mahārāja-Kanikalekha*¹

Āryacandra belonging probably to the same period as that of Mātīcetā, is known as the author of the *Maitreyayākaraṇa* or the *Maitreyasamiti* which is in the form of a dialogue between Gotama Buddha and Śāriputra. The work, translated into various languages, seems to have been very popular.

Very well-known is the name of the poet Āryaśūra, the author of the popular *Jātakamālā*, written after the model of the *Sūtrālankāra*. Among the frescoes in the caves of Ajantā, there are scenes from the *Jātakamālā* with inscribed strophes from Āryaśūra. The inscriptions belong to the sixth century A.D., but as another work of the poet was translated into Chinese in 434 A.D., he must have lived in the fourth century A.D.

The Buddhist Sanskrit literature belonging purely to the Mahāyāna school has preserved a number of books called the Mahāyānasūtras which are mainly devoted to the glorification of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas. The most important of

Āryacan-
dra
Maitreyav
yākaraṇa

Āryaśūra
Jātakamālā

Saddhar-
mapunda-
rīka,
Kālanda
vyūha,
Sukhā-
vatīvyūha
and
Aksobhya-
vyūha

¹ F W Thomas Mātīcetā and the Mahārāja-Kanikalekha (IA Vol XXXII)

them is the *Saddharmapundarika* written in the manner of the Purānas. The book which is a glorification of Buddha Sakyamuni, contains elements of quite different periods, for it is believed that Sanskrit prose and Gathas in mixed Sanskrit could not have developed at the same time. The book was translated into Chinese between 225 A.D. and 316 A.D. The original, therefore must have been composed not later than the second century A.D. Some scholars, however like to give it an early date. But even Professor Kern has not been able to find out passages which may show any ancient thought. Another work is the *Karanda vyūha* preserved in two versions and betraying a theistic tendency. It contains a glorification of the Bodhisattva Avolokitesvara. It was translated into Chinese as early as 270 A.D. The *Sukhāvatīvyūha* in which is glorified the Buddha Amitabha, is one more important book in which the reader may find a longing for spiritual liberation. The *Aksobhyavyuha* which was translated into Chinese between 385 A.D. and 433 A.D., contains an account of Buddha Aksobhya.

The philosophical writings of Buddhist

Philosophical literature

poets constitute no mean contribution to early Sanskrit literature. Among philosophical works belonging to the earliest Mahāyānasūtras mention should be made of the *Prajñāpāramitās* which occupy a unique place from the point of view of the history of religion. The Chinese translation of a *Prajñāpāramitā* was made as early as 179 A.D. Other philosophical Mahāyānasūtras are the *Buddhāratamsaka*, the *Gandavyūha*, the *Daśabhūmaka*, the *Ratnakūta*, the *Rāśtrapāla*, the *Lankāvatāra*, the *Samādhiṇīja* and the *Suvartanapriabhāṣa*.

Nāgārjuna
his works

The *Mādhyamikakārikā* which is a systematic philosophical work of the class with which we are familiar in the Brāhmaṇic philosophical literature was written in a metrical form (in four hundred verses) by Nāgārjuna whose name is associated with the Kusāna King Kaniska.¹ Nāgārjuna is also known as the author of the *Akutobhaya*, a commentary on his own work, which is preserved in a Tibetan translation. The *Yuktisastikā*, the *Śūnyatāsaptati*, the *Pratītyasamutpādahrdaya*, the *Mahāyānavimśaka*, the *Vigrahavyāvartanī*,

¹ Some think that Nāgārjuna lived at the close of the second century A.D.

the *Elaslokasutra*, the *Prajñadanda* and a few commentaries are his other works. There is another work the *Dharmasamgraha*, which passes as his composition¹.

In the Chinese translations (101 A.D.) of the biographies of Asvaghosa and Nāgīrjuna there occurs the name of one Āryadeva. His *Catusatala* is a work on the Mādhyamika system and is a polemic directed against the Brāhmaṇic ritual. His other works are the *Dvadasanīlavyākastra* and the *Cittaruddhiprātarana*. Maitreyanātha, the real founder of the Yogācāra school, is the author of the *Abhisamayalalatālalitas*, translated into Chinese probably in the fourth century A.D. Ārya Asanga the famous student of Maitreyanātha, wrote the *Yogacarabhūmiśastra* besides a few works preserved in Chinese translations. Visu bandhu Asanga, a strong adherent of the Sarvāstivādin school, whom Professor Tākakusu places between 420 A.D. and 500 A.D. and to whom Professor Wogihara assigns a date between 390 A.D. and 470 A.D., wrote the *Abhidharmaśāstra* and the *Paramarthaśāptati* to combat the Sāṅkhya.

Āryadeva
Maitreya
nātha
Ārya
Asanga
and
Vasubandhu
Asanga
their works

¹ The *Suhṛllekha* is ascribed to Nāgīrjuna. It contains no Mādhyamika doctrine.

philosophy. In his later life, when he is believed to have been converted into Mahāyāna, he wrote the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*.

Dignāga is the chief of the early philosophers who had made valuable contribution through his masterpieces, the *Pramānasamuccaya* and the *Nyāyapravesa*. He lived probably in the fifth century A.D. To the same century probably belonged Śthūmatī and Dharmapāla who wrote valuable commentaries on the Mādhyamika system.¹

Dignāga
his works

Avadāna
literature

The vast field of Avadāna literature presents a good and sufficient specimen of Sanskrit writing by Buddhist poets. The word *avadāna* signifies a 'great religious or moral achievement as well as the history of a great achievement'. Such a great act may consist in the sacrifice of one's own life, but also may be confined to the founding of an institution for the supply of incense, flowers, gold and jewels to, or the building of, sanctuaries. Avadāna stories are designed to inculcate that dark (ignoble) deeds bear

¹ Later philosophical works, belonging to definitely identified schools of Buddhism, e.g., the works of Yaśomitra, Candrakīrti, Śāntideva, Dharmakīrti, Dharmottara and others, will be treated in detail in a subsequent chapter on Philosophy.

dark (ignoble) fruits while white (noble) acts beget white (noble) fruits. Thus they are also tales of *larmāṇi*.

The *Avadānaśataka* heads the list of works on Avadāna literature. It consists of ten decades each having a theme of its own. Another work the *Karmasātakā*, preserved only in the Tibetan translation bears close affinity to the former. Yet another collection of stories in Tibetan (translated of course, from original Sanskrit) is known in the world's literature as *Dsanglun*.

Ayadāna
śataka and
Karmasa
taka

A well known collection of Avadāna literature is the *Dvayavādāna*. The book belongs broadly to the Hīnayāna school but traces of Mahayānistic influence may yet be discovered. The collection is composed of many materials and no uniformity of language is, therefore, possible. But the language is lucid, and true poetry is not wanting. The book has a great importance from the standpoint of Indian sociology. As regards the time of redaction, it may be said that as Asoka's successors down to Pusya mitra are mentioned and the word *dīnāya* is frequently used a date prior to the second century A.D., can hardly be assigned to it.

Dvayava
dāna

Mention may be made of the *Aśokava-*

dāna, the cycle of stories having for its central theme the history of Aśoka. Historically, these stories have little or no value. The work was translated into Chinese as early as the third century A.D. A passing reference may be made to the *Kalpadrumādānamālā*, the *Ratnādānamālā* and the *Dvāvimsatyavadāna*, and minor *avadānas*

Asokāvadāna, Kalpadrumādānamālā,
Ratnādānamālā,
Dvāvimsatyavadāna
and minor
avadānas

REFERENCES

Keith, A. B. : A History of Sanskrit Literature
 Kern H. Manual of Buddhism
 Nariman, G. K. Literary History of Sanskrit
 Buddhism
 Raychaudhuri, H. C. Political History of Ancient India
 Smith, V. A. Oxford History of India
 Winteritz, M. A History of Indian Literature,
 Vol. II

¹ A most extensive work on *Avadāna*-literature is the *Avadānakalpalatā* of Ksemendra of the eleventh century A.D. The work has been written in the style of ornate Court-epics.

CHAPTER SIX

COURT EPICS

A

INTRODUCTION

Authoritative writers on Sanskrit rhetoric have given an exhaustive list of the characteristics of epic poems in Classical Sanskrit. These characteristics may be divided under *two* heads. Of them the essential characteristics, the more important, are based on the conception of the *three* constituents of poetry viz., the plot (*vastu*) the hero (*neti*) and the sentiment (*rasa*).¹ The plot of an epic must have a historical basis and should not be fictitious. The hero must be an accomplished person of high lineage and should be of the type technically called

Character
istics es
sential

¹ Generally the sentiments are *eight* in number viz. *sringūra* (erotic) *hāsyā* (comic) *karuna* (pathetic) *raudra* (furious) *vira* (heroic) *bhayānaka* (terrible) *bibhatsa* (disgustful) and *adbhuta* (marvellous). It is held by some that the *sānta* (quietistic) was added later on by Abhinavagupta the erudite commentator on Bharata's *Natyasāstra*. This was perhaps added for representing the spirit of *mahāprasthāna* in the *Mahābhārata*. It is even urged that Bharata has enumerated the eight sentiments for the drama only and not for the epic.

Dhūrodatta Delineation of various sentiments and emotions is the third characteristic

Character
istics
non-essen-
tial

The non-essential characteristics which are formal and apply only to technique, are many in number. They demand (i) that the epic should begin with a benediction, salutation or statement of facts, (ii) that chapters or sections should bear the appellation *sāgā* (iii) that the number of cantos should not exceed *thirty* and should not be less than *eight*, (iv) that the number of verses in each canto should not generally be less than *thirty* and should not exceed *two hundred*, (v) that there should be descriptions of sunrise and sunset pools and gardens, amorous sports and pleasure-trips and the like, (vi) that the development of the plot should be natural and the five punctures of the plot (*sandhis*) should be well-arranged, and (vii) that the last two or three stanzas of each canto should be composed in a different metre or metres¹

¹ It is easy to find that these characteristics are not always present in every epic. The *Hāravijaya* in fifty cantos, some cantos of the *Nāradhīyacarita* containing more than *two hundred* verses and the first canto of the *Bhālikāvya* having only *twenty-seven* verses, are examples to the point.

B

GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF COURT EPICS

The name of Asvaghosa has come down to us as one of the earliest known epic poets. An account of his two great epics the *Buddhacarita* and the *Saundarananda* has already been given in a preceding chapter.

A vaghosa

The next great epic poet is Kalidasa whose age can hardly be determined with any amount of precision. It is most deplorable that scholars differ widely in their opinions in fixing the age of this prince of Indian poets. The most popular theory of the day states that the poet flourished during the reign of Candragupta II (380 A.D.—415 A.D.), that his powers were at their highest during the reign of Kumaragupta I (415 A.D.—455 A.D.) and that he lived to see the reign of Skandagupta (455 A.D.—480 A.D.)¹

K l dasa
his age

¹The date of Kalidasa is one of the most perplexing questions in the history of Sanskrit literature and the opinions of scholars however ingeniously conceived fail to give us definiteness and certainty. It is a fact to be regretted that India has not preserved the history of her greatest poet and dramatist. Tradition has been busy in weaving round the name of Kalidasa many fictitious stories and it is almost impossible to

The *Kumārasambhava* of Kālidāsa is an epic in seventeen cantos of which the first eight are believed to be genuine. Mallinātha writes his commentary on the first eight

separate at such a distant date the historical fact from its rich colouring of fables. The traditional theory makes Kālidāsa a contemporary of the Vikrama Samvat, the initial year of which is 57 B C. Among the chief supporters of this theory are the late Sir William Jones, Dr Peterson, Principal S Roy, and Mr I R Bālasubrahmanyam. Principal Roy has argued that the Bhītā medallion found near Allahabad by Dr Marshall in 1909-10 A D pictures a scene which looks exactly like the opening scene of the *Śākuntala*. The medallion belongs to the Sunga period 185-73 B C. Moreover, the diction and style of Kālidāsa definitely establishes him as a predecessor of Aśvaghosa who has made use of the description of Aja's entry to the capital found in the *Raghuvamśa*, and has borrowed Kālidāsa's words and style. But archaeologists are of opinion that the scene found in the Allahabad Bhītā medallion cannot be definitely proved to be identical with the scene in the *Śākuntala*. Professor Cowell in his edition of the *Buddhacarita* remarks that it is Kālidāsa who imitates Aśvaghosa and not vice versa. Mr Bālasubrahmanyam has based his theory on the internal evidences found in Kālidāsa's dramas. Thus the epilogue of the *Mūlavikāgnimitra* supports that Kālidāsa lived in the reign of Agnimitra, the son of Pusyamitra, of the first century B C. The system of law, specially that of inheritance, as found

cantos alone. There is also difference of opinion regarding the propriety of the theme of the later cantos. The theme of the epic is the marriage of Lord Siva and Umā and the

in the *Sakuntala* points to the fact that the poet must have lived before the beginning of the Christian era. Moreover there was one Vikramāditya in Ujjayini in the first century B.C. and Kālidāsa's works indirectly allude to him as the poet lived in his court.

Dr Peterson has no particular argument to take his stand upon. He simply writes Kālidāsa stands near the beginning of the Christian era if indeed he does not overtop it. Sir William Jones in his introduction to the *Sakuntala* advances no argument but accepts the B.C. theory.

Another theory places Kālidāsa in the sixth century A.D. The late MM. Haraprasāda Sastri one of the supporters of this theory has pointed out that the defeat of Hūnas by Raghu in course of his world conquest refers to the conquest of Hūnas by Skandagupta (455 A.D.—480 A.D.). And the terms Dīnga and Nicula occurring in the *Maqhaduta* refer to the great teachers who lived before Kālidāsa. Professor Max Muller another adherent of this doctrine has based his theory on the suggestions of Professor Fergusson who points out that the era of the Mālavas was put back to 36 B.C. and the odharma deva Visnugārdhāna Vikramāditya who conquered the Hūnas in 344 A.D. commemorated his victory by starting the Mālava era. But in doing so he willingly ante dated it by 600 years. Fergusson's theory (known as

birth of Kāttikeya who vanquished the demon Tāraka. Scholars are of opinion that the work is one of the first compositions of the poet.

The *Raghuvamśa*, which is undoubtedly a production of a mature hand, deals with the life-history of the kings of the Iksvāku family in general and of Rāma in particular. The Kuru theory, however, has been exploded by Dr. Fleet who pointed out by his researches that there was no Vikramāditya who achieved a victory over the Hūnas in 544 A.D., and furthermore, that there was in existence an era known as the Mālava era long before 544 A.D. Thus the theory of Professor Max Müller is without any historical value. In this connection, mention may be made of his once popular and now discredited 'Renaissance Theory of Classical Sanskrit Literature', which states that there was a revival of the Sanskrit learning and literature in the wake of the Gupta civilization and culture and that Kālidāsa was the best flower of this age.

It is, however, generally believed that Kālidāsa flourished in the reign of Candragupta II of the Imperial Gupta dynasty (380 A.D.—415 A.D.). But it has been argued that his best works were written during the reign of Kumāragupta I (415 A.D.—455 A.D.). But some would like to suggest that the poet lived to see the reign of Skandagupta (455 A.D.—480 A.D.). It should be noted, however, that both Candragupta and Skandagupta held the title of 'Vikramāditya', while Kumāragupta had the title of 'Mahendrāditya'.

The epic which is composed in *nineteen* cantos, is the tale of Vālmīki retold with the mastery of a finished poet. It is said that the work fulfils to a considerable extent the conditions of Sanskrit epic poetry.

It is not difficult to surmise the date of Bhāravī as his name is mentioned along with Kalidāsa in the famous Aihole inscription of Pulikeshin II, dated 634 A.D. Bhāravī has to his credit only one epic viz., the *Kiratajuniya* which is based on the *Mahabharata*. The poem describes how Arjuna obtained the Pasupata weapon from Siva. The work is in *nineteen* cantos and is written in an ornate style, though full of dignity of sense (*arthagaurava*) with occasional jingling of words.

Nowhere in the literature of the world can be found a single instance where poetry has been written with the sole object of illustrating the rules and principles of grammar. The *Bhattikavya* or *Rāavanāradha* which is written in *twenty two* cantos, is divided into four sections, viz., *Pralīnakanda*, *Piasannakanda*, *Alankaralanda* and *Tinatalanda*. The poem is an epic depicting the life history of Rāma from his birth up to the time of Rāvana's death. The author of this

Bhāravī
Kātār
juniya

Bhatti
Rāvana
vadha

epic, Bhattī, must be distinguished from the great grammarian-philosopher Bhāṭṭhārī, popularly known as Harī. The author writes in his own work that he lived in Valabhī under one Śridhārasena. History gives us four Dhārasenas, the last of whom died in 651 A.D. It is, therefore, probable that Bhattī flourished in the latter half of the sixth and the first quarter of the seventh century A.D. It may be mentioned in this connection that Bhattī lived before Bhāmaha, the great rhetorician who decides the poetic excellence of the *Rāvanavadha*.¹ Though the work is a grammatical poem, still in more places than one the poet has given ample proof of his artistic talents. The second, tenth and twelfth cantos of the poem may be cited as instances.

Kumāradāsa, said to be the King of Ceylon from 517 A.D. to 526 A.D., is mentioned as a poet of remarkable talent by Rājaśekhaṇa. It is maintained by Dr. Keith that the poet knew the *Kāshikātti* (650 A.D.), and was known to Vāmana (800 A.D.). The theme of his poem, the *Jānakīharana*, in twenty-five cantos, is taken from the *Rāmāyaṇa*, as the

Kumāra
dāsa
Jānakī
harana

¹ *KL* II 20

title indicates. The poet follows in the foot steps of Kalidasa. Though he does not display imagination of a high order, he may still be called a vigorous descriptive poet. He is fond of alliteration, but he is careful enough not to carry it to the point of affectation.

Anandavardhana the great rhetorician of the ninth century A.D. mentions Māgha who must have flourished in the eighth century A.D. He was the son of Dittulāśarvāśraya and mentions Jinendrabuddhi, the author of the famous grammatical work, the *Nyasa* whose date is believed to be 700 A.D.¹ Māgha's *Sīrapalāvadha* is a work in twenty cantos based on a legend of the *Mahabharata*. His style is extremely ornate and he often sacrifices sense for jugglery in words. He imitates Bhāravi but his style is without the dignity of the latter. But it must be admitted on all hands that he commands much luxuriance of expression and thought.

The fascinating story of Nūli and Dumyanti in the *Mahabharata* forms the central theme of Sriharsa's masterpiece the *Nāradhacarita* or *Nāradhuyacarita* which was written in the latter half of the twelfth

Māgha
Sīrapalā
vadha

Sīharsa
Nāradh
carita

¹ *SV* n 112

century A D The work is written in *twenty-two* cantos. The poet is a scholar of repute in the different systems of Indian philosophy and has a thorough command over grammar and lexicon. Though he does not show that power of poetical suggestion which distinguishes the writings of great Indian poets like Kālidāsa, his power of expression is singularly captivating. What strikes us as his defect is that he has a special liking for exaggerated statements in the form of poetic conceit.

C

LESSER EPIC POEMS

<i>Jumbavatīvijaya</i>	} ascribed to Pāṇini—according to some, the two are the names of the one and the same book—not free from grammatical errors—the authorship is much disputed
<i>Pūtūla-vijaya</i>	
<i>Vātaruca-kūvya</i>	lost to us
<i>Padyacūdumani</i>	ascribed to Buddhaghosa (not later than the fifth century A D)
<i>Kunteśvaradaautya</i>	ascribed to Kālidāsa by Ksemendra
<i>Hayagrīvavadha</i>	a lost work by Bhartṛmentha who flourished under Mātigupta of the sixth century A D praised by Rājāsekhaṇa

Padmapurāna by Ravisena of the seventh century
 A D—containing a glorification of Rāshabha the
 first Tīrthakara

Rājanīrjuniya or *Ārjunarājanya* } by Bhaumaka—written in
 twenty seven cantos in the
 fashion of Bhatti—based on
 the strife between Kīrtavīrya
 and Rāvana

Hari amśapurāna by Jinasena of the eighth century
 A D—in sixty six cantos—describing the
 story of the *Mahābhārata* in a Jīnistic setting

Kapphanībhuyudaya by Śivasvāmin a Kīshmirian
 Buddhist during the reign of Avantivarman of
 the ninth century A D—written in twenty
 cantos—based on a tale in the *Avadānasatka*

Haravijaya by Ratnīkara a Kīshmirian of the
 ninth century A D—based on the slaying of
 the demon Andhaka by Śiva—written in fifty
 cantos— influenced by Bīma and Mīgha

Rūghaṇapāndariya by Kavirīja—mentioned by Rīja
 ēkhara—probably of the ninth century A D
 —giving us the two stories of the *Rāmuyana*
 and the *Mahābhārata* simultaneously through
 double entendre

Mahāpurāna by Jinasena and Gunabhadra of the
 ninth century A D—containing two parts the
Ādiapurāna and the *Uttarapurāna*

Parītabhuyudaya by Jinasena of the ninth century
 A D who has incorporated the entire *Megha
 dūta* while relating the story of Pārvanītha

Kūdambarikathāsāra by Abhinanda son of the logi-
 cian Jayantabhatta of the tenth century A D

Yaśodharacarita by Vādināja of the first quarter of the tenth century A D—written in *four* cantos

Karmahasya by Halāyudha of the tenth century A D—containing an eulogy of King Kīṣna III—written after the style of Bhāṭṭī

Rāmacarita by Abhinanda, son of Satānanda of unknown date

Rāmāyanamañjari by Kṣemendra of the eleventh and *Bhīratamañjari* [century A D

Yaśodharacarita by Māṇikyaśāmī of the eleventh century A D

Hariñilīsa by Lolumbarāja of the eleventh century A D

Śrīkanthacarita by Mankha—a Kāshmīrian and a pupil of Ruyyaka of the twelfth century A D—written in *twenty-five* cantos—based on the tale of the destruction of the demon Tūpura by Śiva

Śatruñjayamūhūrtmya by Dhaneśvara of the twelfth century A D written in *fourteen* cantos—containing a glorification of the sacred mountain Śatruñjaya

Triśaṣṭisalākūpuruṣacarita by Hemacandra of 1088-1172 A D—a highly important work, its seventh book being called the *Jaina-Rāmāyaṇa*, the tenth entitled the *Māhāvīracarita*, containing the life-story of Māhāvīra, and its appendix-section, the *Parīśiṣṭaparivāra*, being a mine of fairy tales and stories

Dharmaśārmābhūdaya by Haricandra of unknown date—written in *twenty-one* cantos

Neminirāna by Viśvabhūta of the twelfth century A D—in fifteen cantos—dealing with Neminītha's life

Balabharata by Amarakandra of the thirteenth century A D

Puṇjatacaritra and } by Dvārakābhāsūri of the
Mrgatāticaritra } thirteenth century A D

Pṛṣṭanīthacarita by Bhīṣadevāśūri of the thirteenth century A D

Hariṇāma by Sakalakṛti and his pupil Jīvādīsa of the fifteenth century A D

Rasikāñjana by Rūmīcandra of the sixteenth century A D—describing the two sentiments of love and asceticism through *double entendre*

Puṇjatapurāna by Subhacandra of the sixteenth century A D—also called the *Jaina Māhabhīrata*

Rūgharāṇasādhīya by Haradattasūri of unknown date

Rūgharāṇapuṇjāyayādāṇīya by Cidambara of unknown date

REFERENCES

Keith A B A History of Sanskrit Literature

Macdonell A A A History of Sanskrit Literature

Winternitz M A History of Indian Literature Vol II

CHAPTER SEVEN

DRAMA

A

ORIGIN OF SANSKRIT DRAMA

The origin of Sanskrit drama is a most interesting study in the history of Sanskrit literature and divergent views are found amongst scholars which can hardly be reconciled. It is an undeniable fact that Bharata's *Nātyaśāstra* is the earliest known book on Sanskrit dramaturgy. The third century A.D. is the generally accepted date of the *Nātyaśāstra*, and some scholars hold that the book is a compilation on the basis of an original work of the Sūtra-type. According to a legend found in this book, Brahmā created drama by taking passages for recitation from the *Rgveda*, songs from the *Sāma-veda*, gestures from the *Yajur-veda* and emotions from the *Atharvaveda*. Thus a drama is known as the fifth Veda. From Śiva and Pārvatī, Tāndava and Lāsyā dances were obtained and Viṣṇu gave the Rīti. The same book also informs us that the dramas were enacted during the Indradhvaja festival where the sons and disciples of the sage Bharata together with Gandharvas and Apsaras took

Orthodox
view

part in the play. The first two plays enacted were the *Amitamanthana* and the *Tripuradaha* both written by Brahma himself.

There was a time when the theory of the Greek origin of Indian drama found its adherents amongst scholars¹. The chief exponent was Professor Windisch (1882) who found many striking similarities between Greek and Sanskrit plays and based his theory on the ground that Indians were in touch with Greeks for a considerable period after the invasion of Alexander and that none of the extant Sanskrit plays belongs to a pre Christian date. Thus to him the very classification into acts, the prologues and the epilogues, the way in which the actors make their entrance and exit the term *yājanīya* the theme and its manipulation the variety of stage directions the typical characters like the *Vidūsaka*, *Pratinayaka* etc,—all smell of Greek origin. This theory was further corroborated by the discovery in the Sitabenga cave of the Greek theatre in its Indian imitation². But this theory has

Theory of
Greek
Origin

¹ The suggestion came from Professor Webster but Professor Pischel vehemently repudiated it.

On the antiquities of Ramgarh Hill District of Sarguja—IA Vol II

been rejected as the points of contrast are far too many. The absence of the *three unities* of *Time, Space and Action* in a Sanskrit drama brings it nearer to an Elizabethan drama than to a Greek drama where the three unities are essential. The difference in time between two acts in a Sanskrit drama may be several years (e.g., the *Uttarārāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti where twelve years intervene between the incidents of the first two acts). Moreover, it is only in a particular act of a Sanskrit drama that the actions which happen in a single place are usually represented. Thus while the sixth act of the *Sāhuntala* represents the scene at King Dusyanta's palace, the seventh act shows the scene at sage Mānica's hermitage on the top of the Himālayas and the first part of it represents the king's aerial journey. As for the term *yavamhā*, most scholars think that it is of later introduction and it refers to Persian tapestries and not to anything Greek.

On the other hand, there are some scholars who want to determine the origin of Sanskrit dramas in the same manner in which Western scholars seek to explain the origin of European plays. So it has been argued that as the first Sanskrit play is stated

to have been produced at the Indradhvaja festival (which has a parallel in the May pole dance in Europe), the origin of Sanskrit drama is to be connected with the festivities of the spring after the passing away of the winter. But this theory is rejected as MM Haraprasada Sāstrin has pointed out that the aforesaid Indradhvaja festival comes off at the end of the rains.

Professor Ridgeway has connected the origin of Indian drama with the worshipping of dead ancestors. But the theory is inapplicable to the case of Indian Aryans whose ritual of the disposing of the dead has the minimum ostentation.

Ridgeway's theory

The Kṛṣṇa worship is thought by some scholars to be the origin of Sanskrit plays. Thus the role which the Sauraseni Prākrit plays in a Sanskrit drama is easily explained. But this theory involves anachronism as it remains to be proved that Kṛṣṇa dramas are the earliest Sanskrit dramas.¹

Kṛṣṇa cult origin

Professor Pischel has set forth the theory that Sanskrit drama in its origin was a puppet play. The stage manager in a Sans-

Pischel's theory

¹ It may be proved in the same way that the theories of the Viṣṇu cult, Śiva cult or Rāma cult origin of Indian drama cannot be accepted.

kūt dīama is called Sūtiadhāra (the holder of the string) and his assistant Sthāpaka is to enter immediately after the stage-manager and is expected to place in proper position, the plot, the hero or the germ of the play. The puppets also are frequently mentioned in Sanskrit literature. They could be made to dance or move about and they could even be made to talk. Such a talking puppet, impersonating Sītā, is found in one of Rājaśekhara's plays. The episode of the Shadow-Sītā in Bhavabhūti's *Uttarānāmacarita* is reminiscent of the old shadow-play in ancient India. But this theory cannot furnish sufficient explanation of Sanskrit dīama in all its bearings, such as, the mixture of prose and verse in a Sanskrit play, as also the varieties of languages and the like.¹

Another theory on this subject states that the origin of Sanskrit dīama should be sought in the Samvāda-hymns of the *Rgveda*. These ballad hymns which are nearly twenty in number, are marked by a dramatic spirit.²

Origin to
be traced to
the Vedic
period

¹ Professor Hillebrandt has argued that Professor Pischel's theory cannot be accepted as the puppet-play assumes the pre-existence of the dīama.

² *RV* I 165 170 and 179, III 33, IV 18, VII 33, VIII 100, X 11, 28, 51—53, 86, 95 and 108, etc.

There are no specific ritualistic applications accompanying these *Sāṇivādā* hymns and they seem to have been recited between the intervals of long sacrificial sessions (*pārī plava*) for the satisfaction of the patrons of sacrifices. But whether the hymns were treated as ballads (as Professors Pischel and Geldner thought), or as regular ritualistic dramas with actual stage directions and action including singing and dancing (as held by Professor von Schioeder), or, finally, as narrative stories with an admixture of prose to connect the poems into one whole, with a preponderance of dialogue (as maintained by Professor Oldenbeig)—is still keenly disputed amongst scholars.¹

It has been universally found that the growth of drama is intimately connected with royal patronage. And India is no exception. Bearing in our mind the existence of the ritualistic drama which marks the early beginnings of Indian plays we can boldly assert that Sanskrit drama is a product of the Indian mind which viewed life in all its various aspects and passed through many stages of development, being

Conclusion

¹ Professor Hertel has found a full drama in the *Suparnādhyāya*

influenced by Jainism and Buddhism in its allegorical sphere or by any other foreign factor and yet maintaining its own peculiarity. No one theory, therefore, can adequately explain all its features and as such one should refrain from making a choice of any one of them.

B

CHARACTERISTICS OF SANSKRIT DRAMA

According to Indian thinkers the best of poets is a dramatist. Sanskrit drama evolved in all its aspects in a particularly Indian atmosphere. Sanskrit dramatists with their inherent aesthetic sense gave more importance to the portrayal of the sentiment than to the character or the plot. Sanskrit dramas were, therefore, highly idealistic and romantic in their character. Though the best of Sanskrit dramas glow with occasional touches of realism, still the fact cannot be denied that the poetic value has never been sacrificed for direct delineation of action or character. Nevertheless we cannot say that

Predomi-
nance of
sentiment

Sanskrit dramatists were totally indifferent to the action of a drama, and it has been said clearly that a drama must have five critical junctures of plot (*sandhi*) viz *mulha* (opening or *protasis*), *pratimula* (progression or *epitasis*) *garbha* (development or *catastasis*), *umar a* (pause or *peripeteia*) and *mira hana* (conclusion or *catastrophe*). It has been the usual convention with Sanskrit poets that they select the Erotic the Heroic or the Quietistic as the principal sentiment in a *Nāṭyā* (the type of major dramas) which is assisted by every other sentiment according to propriety. It needs to be added here that in the opinion of some thinkers the aforesaid convention should not command any respect and any one of the nine sentiments may be the predominant sentiment in a *Nāṭyā*.

A charge is often levelled by critics that Sanskrit drama is marred by an absence of tragedy, but it may be answered by saying that what is known as *Vipralambha sangara* (love in separation) more than compensates for the comparatively rare 'Pathetic' which is the prominent sentiment in only one class of minor dramas. But it is a fact that Sanskrit dramas have never a tragic critics

Absence of
tragedy

tragedy, and the reason is to be found in the conception that it mars the sentiment. Hence the representation of death, murder, war, revolution and anything indecorous which is a hiatus in aesthetic pleasure, has been prohibited on the stage.

Hero

As the main interest in Sanskrit drama lies in the creation of the sentiment, it is convenient for a dramatist to take a plot with a popular theme. The hero of the drama must be an accomplished person of high lineage and should belong to the Dhritrāṣṭra type. He must be a hero either of the earth or of heaven, and sometimes even we find in Sanskrit drama gods side by side with mortal men, and thus is given ample scope to the dramatist's imagination to create the appropriate romantic atmosphere.

Morality and drama

Like every other branch of Indian literature, Sanskrit drama has also a religious basis and nothing violating the moral and religious code has been represented in Sanskrit drama.

C

CLASSIFICATION OF SANSKRIT DRAMAS

It must be said at the outset that the Sanskrit synonym for drama is *Rūpaka* and not *Nāṭaka*, the latter being a variety of the former which has a more comprehensive import. Authors on Sanskrit dramaturgy have classified Sanskrit dramas into two types (1) the major (*Rūpaka*) and (2) the minor (*Uparūpaka*). The varieties of each type differ according to different authorities. The following is the list given by *Visvanātha* in his *Sahityadarpana* of the varieties of the two types of Sanskrit dramas.

*Rūpaka &
Uparūpaka*

- 1 The major type (i) *Nāṭaka* (e.g. *Abhijñanashākuntala* of *Kālidāsa*) (ii) *Pri
kāvya* (e.g. *Malatimadhava* of *Bhīṣmabhūti*) (iii) *Bhāṣā* (e.g., *Karpuracarita* of *Vatsavāyī*) (iv) *Vyayoga* (e.g. *Madhyama vyayoga* of *Bhāṣā*) (v) *Samavakarā* (e.g., *Samudrāma
thana* of *Vatsavāyī*) (vi) *Dīpti* (e.g., *Tripu
radāha* of *Vatsavāyī*) (vii) *Ilamṛgā* (e.g., *Rulminiharana* of *Vatsavāyī*) (viii) *Anku* or *Utsrṣṭikāṅka* (e.g., *Sai mīḍhayayati*) (ix) *Vithi* (e.g., *Malavilā*) and (x) *Prahṛṣṭā* (e.g., *Mattavilasa* of *Mahendravilāmaṇi*)

2 The minor type (i) Nātikā (e.g., *Raṭnāratī* of Śiśi-Haiṣa) (ii) Triotaka (e.g., *Vikramorvaśi* of Kālidāsa) (iii) Gosthī (e.g., *Rārvatamadanihā*) (iv) Sattaka (e.g., *Kārpūravamañjari* of Rājaśekhaṇa) (v) Nātyaśāsaka (e.g., *Tilāśarati*) (vi) Piasthāna (e.g., *Śingāratilaka*) (vii) Ullāpva (e.g., *Deviśāma-hādeva*) (viii) Kāvya (e.g., *Yādāvodaya*) (ix) Pienkhana (e.g., *Vāluadha*) (x) Rāsaka (e.g., *Menahāhita*) (xi) Samlāpaka (e.g., *Māyāhā-pālaka*) (xii) Śiśigadita (e.g., *Kiñdārasātala*) (xiii) Śilpaka (e.g., *Kanakāvatīmādhava*) (xiv) Vilāsikā (no work mentioned in *SD*) (xv) Dūrmallikā (e.g., *Bindumatī*) (xvi) Piakaṇamikā (no work mentioned in *SD*) (xvii) Halliṣa (e.g., *Keliavataka*) and (xviii) Bhānikā (e.g., *Kāmadattā*)¹

¹ The works, against which authors are mentioned, have now been published and are all available. The other works are only mentioned by the author of the *Sāhityadarpana* and are not actually known to exist at present.

D

GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF SANSKRIT DRAMA

Introduction

The Indian drama can be traced to the fifth or the fourth century B.C. Panini refers to dramatic aphorisms¹ and the *Asthashastra* of Kuntilya, which is a book of the fourth century B.C., contains reference to the term *Kusalaya*, which may have an allusion to the twin sons of Rama or to the proverbially bad character of actors. The *Mahabhasya*, beside its reference to the dramas, *Kamsaradha* and *Balibandha*, speaks of the pantomime of actors and of the three kinds of artists. In the *Ramayana* we find the mention of Nata and the *Mahabharata* refers to a wooden feminine figure². In the *Harivamsha*, however, we find unmistakable reference to a full fledged drama acted by Krsna's descendants. But Dr. Keith looks upon all these evidences as mere references to pantomimes and not to pure dramas. He, however, admits that the dramas of Asvaghosa and Bhasa, the first extant dramas

¹ *Ast* IV m 110² *Mbh* III xxx 23

reflected in the number of his plays and the variety of their themes. The style of Bhasa is simple, at the same time forceful and conforms to what is known as the *Vaidarbha* style. The initial characteristic of the dramas of Bhasa is action which has never been sacrificed for poetry and poetic charm. In fact the plays of Bhasa are really of dramatic value and qualities of a very high order. On the other hand there are scholars who hold that the dramas in their present forms are not the composition of one and the same poet but they are the composite product of the plagiarism of many scribes. Some scholars have gone so far even as to surmise the existence of a genuine Bhasa of whose works the extant plays are mere abridgement by the traditional players of Southern India (especially Kerala).

The thirteen plays of Bhasa may be arranged under three heads according to the sources from which the plots have been taken — (a) plots taken from the *Ramayana*, (b) plots taken from the *Mahabharata*, the *Harivamsha* and the Puranas, and (c) plots taken probably from the *Brhatkatha* of Gunadhya and other popular sources.

Appreciation

Classification of
Bhasa's
dramas

The *Priatimā* (Nātaka) which is the most popular of the *Rāmāyana*-plays, is written in *seven* acts. The story starts from the death of King Daśaratha and ends with Rāma's return to Ayodhyā from Lankā. The second play, based on the *Rāmāyana*, is the *Abhiseka* (Nātaka) in *six* acts. The subject-matter is the coronation of Rāma.

The *Madhyama-vyāyoga* deserves mention first amongst the *Mahābhārata*-plays. This drama (Vyāyoga) in *one* act amply testifies to the skill of the dramatist in depicting characters. The play is based on the tale of Hidimbā's love for Bhīma. The *Dūtaghatotkaca* is also a drama (Vyāyoga) in *one* act which describes Ghatotkaca appearing before the Kauravas immediately after the death of Abhimanyu, with the news that Arjuna is preparing for their punishment. The *Karnabhāra* (Vyāyoga) also contains *one* act, the story being how the armour and equipments of Kārṇa are stolen by Indra. The story of *Uruabhanga* (probably of the Anka type) in *one* act depicts the fight between Bhīma and Duryodhana ending in the breaking of the latter's thigh. The *Dūtavākyā* is also a drama (Vyāgoga) in *one* act where Kṛṣṇa appears as an

ambassador to bring about reconciliation between the contending parties, the Kauravas and the Pandavas, and is ill treated by Duryodhana who tries to entrap him without success. The *Pañcaratra* is a play (Sama-vakāra) in three acts. There the story is how Drona undertakes a sacrifice for Duryodhana and seeks as fee the grant of half the kingdom to the Pandavas and Duryodhana promises on the condition that the Pandavas who were living *incognito*, should be found out within five nights. The *Balacarita* is a drama (Nātaka) in five acts depicting the various incidents in the early life of Kṛṣṇa up to the death of Kamsa. Its plot seems to be derived from the *Harivamśa* and the Puranas describing Kṛṣṇa's life.

Indian critics claim *Sīrṣapnavasāradatta* to be the best of Bhasa's dramas where the poet has displayed his skill of characterization and the fine manipulation of the plot which has made the drama interesting up to the last. The play (Nātaka) contains six acts. The theme of the play is the marriage between Vatsaraja Udayana and Pūdmavati the sister of King Darsaka, which was effected by Yaugandharayana, Udayana's minister, to serve a political

Brhatkatha
plays

purpose To gain the end in view, Yaugandharāyana spread the rumour that Vāsavadattā the former queen of Udayana, had been burnt in a conflagration, but he actually kept her as a deposit to Padmāvatī The *Pratijñāyaugandharāyana* (Nātaka) in four acts is the prelude to *Svapnavāsavadatta* which depicts Yaugandharāyana coming to Ujjayinī and causing Vāsavadattā to escape with Udayana who was taken captive by Piadyota Mahāsenā while the former was out a-hunting The *Cārudatta* is an incomplete drama (Piākarana) in four acts on which Śūdiaka seems to have based his *Mrcchakatīka* The theme is the love-story of Brāhmaṇa Cārudatta and courtesan Vasantasenā The material for this drama was taken from popular stories The *Avimāraka* is a play (Nātaka) in six acts, having for its theme the union of Princess Kūraṅgī with Prince Viṣṇusena alias Avimāraka The plots of all the four dramas are said to have been taken from the *Brhatkathā* and they can be traced to the *Kathāsaritsāgara*

The date and authorship of the *Mrcchakatīka* (Piākarana) in ten acts is still a disputed point in the history of Sanskrit

literature¹ According to some scholars, the drama was written by the poet Dandin who quotes a verse of the *Mrechakatila* in his *Kārvyadarsa*² But the recent discovery of the dramas of Bhīsa shows that the verse is found in the *Carudatta* and the *Balacarita* also, and it is highly probable that the drama was written just after the *Carudatta* nearly about the first century A.D. It is a point to be noted that though Kāshasāhu mentions Bhīsa, Sumilli and Kāvīputri he does not say a word about Sūdraka. In the prologue of the *Mrechakatila* the royal author has been described as master of various Sāstras. He performed a horse sacrifice and in the one hundred and tenth year of his life entered into fire having made over the kingdom to his son. From this it is evident that either this portion of the text is an interpolation or that the real author was some one else. The name

¹ Vāmana is the earliest known writer to quote from the drama of Sūdraka.

² Professor Pischel first ascribes this play to Bhīsa and next to Dandin. According to the orthodox tradition Dandin is the author of three works the other two being the *Kārvyadarsa* and the *Dasa Kumāracarita*.

of King Śūdraka is found in the *Rājataran-*
gīti, the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and the *Skanda-*
purāna. In some of the manuscripts, Śūdraka
 has been described as a minister of Śālivā-
 hana who subsequently became the ruler of
 Pratisthāna. According to Professor
 Konow, Śūdraka is to be identified with the
 Ābhīra prince, Śivadatta. According to Dr
 Fleet, Śūdraka's son Īśvarasena defeated the
 Andhras and established the Cedi era of
 248-49 A.D. The play is a Prakarana in ten
 acts having the love-story of Cāṇḍatta and
 Vasantasenā for its theme. It is a social
 drama with magnificent touches of realism.
 The characterization is of a high standard.
 The drama is highly suggestive on account
 of its simple and dignified style.

Kālidāsa is acclaimed to be the best of
 Indian dramatists, whom Goethe has
 praised in the most fascinating terms.
 Superb characterization, study of human
 nature and wonderful mastery over the
 Sanskrit language have placed him in the
 forefront of Indian dramatists. Kālidāsa
 is not verbose like later Sanskrit dramatists,
 economy being the most remarkable feature
 of his technique. Though Kālidāsa is pre-
 eminently a poet of love, he can use occa-

sionally to a tragic elevation. Every character of Kalidasa's dramas has a core of personality which is sharply individualized. Though it is said that the dramas of Kalidasa lack action to some extent, yet they have a moral purity and a peculiar charm unsurpassed by any other Indian dramatist.

The *Malavikagñimitra* (Nāṭak) undoubtedly an earlier writing of the dramatist is written in five acts. It describes the love story of Mālavika and Agnimitra King of Vidisa and founder of the Sunga dynasty. This drama, unlike the two others, is characterized by quick action. The jester is a veritable rogue and is far more intelligent than the jester in the *Sakuntala*. The female characters and the dancing masters are all productions of really great merit.

Malavik
gnimitra

The second drama, the *Vikramorvāsiya* shows remarkable development over the former in the manipulation of the plot, characterization and language, and there are scholars who think that it is the last of the three dramatic compositions of the poet. The materials for this drama preserved in two recensions, northern and southern have been taken from a Samvāda hymn of the *Rgveda*. This drama (Nāṭak) which is

Vikramor
vāsiya

written in five acts, has for its theme the union of the earthly king Purūravas and the celestial nymph Urvaśī. The fourth act of this drama which is a soliloquy of the love-stricken and frenzied Purūravas, is a novel conception of the dramatist.

The *Abhijñānaśākuntala* or *Śākuntala* is the production of Kālidāsa's mature hand, which has gained world-wide recognition and the play has been translated into many European languages. The drama (Nātaka) which is in seven acts, describes the union of Dusyanta and Śākuntalā. The plot of this drama has been taken from the *Mahābhārata*, but the dramatist has introduced many noble innovations. The story is also to be found in the *Padmapuṣṭi* and the Pāli Jātaka collections. There are four different recensions of this drama, viz., Bengal, North-western, Kāshmīrian and South Indian. According to Professor Pischel, the Bengal recension fully represents the original.

Three dramas are ascribed to Hārṣa, King of Kānyakubja, who reigned from 606 A.D. to 647 A.D.¹ He was the reputed patron of

¹ It is believed by some scholars that the author

Binabhatta who has glorified him in his *Harsacarita*. Harsa's style is not strictly classical but his arrangement of plot is fairly satisfactory.

The *Ratnāvali* is a drama (Nātikā) in four acts which deals with the story of the union of King Udayana and Ratnāvali daughter of the King of Ceylon.

Ratnāvali

The *Priyadarśikā* is also a drama (Nātikā) in four acts having for its theme the union of Udayana and Priyadarśikā daughter of King Drdhavardhan. In both these dramas we have not only a similarity of subject matter and form but also a reminiscence of Kalidasa's *Mālālāgnimitra*.

Priyadar
śikā

The *Nagananda* is a drama (Nātakā) in five acts which describes the self sacrifice of Junūtavāhana, Prince of Vidyādhara.

Nagananda

Mahendravikrama flourished in the first quarter of the seventh century A.D. His *Mattavilasa* is a suce (Prakasā) which describes the moral degenerations of the dramatist's contemporary society.

Mahendra
vikrama
Mattavilasa

Bhavabhūti is the next great name

of these plays was Bīma and not Harsa. Thus Professor Weber attributes *Ratnāvali* to Bīnabhatta while Professors Konow, Winternitz, Levi and others accept Harsa's authorship.

after Kālidāsa who is mentioned by Kalhana in his *Rājataranginī* as a poet in the court of Yaśovarman, King of Kānyakubja whose probable date is 736 A.D. Vākpati also refers to Bhavabhūti in his *Gaudarāha*. As is evident from the prologue of the *Mālatīmādhava*, Bhavabhūti could not enjoy any popularity in his life-time. Nevertheless, Bhavabhūti displays a masterly skill in characterization, and his language is forceful. Though he is pre-eminently a poet of the Pathetic sentiment, he has excelled his great predecessor in the delineation of the Heroic and the Wonderful. Bhavabhūti is a follower of the Gauda style, while Kālidāsa is an advocate of the Vaidarbha. Bhavabhūti amplifies his theme, while Kālidāsa suggests it.

Three dramas are ascribed to Bhavabhūti of which the *Mahāvīracarita* is the earliest. The drama (Nātaka) is written in seven acts, depicting the heroic achievements of Rāma's early life. The plot is based on the *Rāmā�ana*, but the dramatist has introduced several significant innovations.

The *Mālatīmādhava* is a Prakāśana in ten acts which deals with the love-story of Mālatī and Mādhava. According to some scholars, it is the latest of all his dramas.

The *Uttararamacarita* is regarded as the best product of Bhavabhūti's virile pen where the dramatist has shown his wonderful skill in delineating genuine pathos and describing the sublime and awful aspects of nature. The plot of this drama (*Nāṭaka*) which is written in seven acts, covers the later life of Rāma, beginning from the banishment of Sītā and ending in their happy re-union.

Uttarā
macarita

The date of Visaladattī may be placed somewhere about 860 A.D. as the lunar eclipse mentioned in his drama *Mudrārājasa* refers to the phenomenon of that date. The drama (*Nāṭaka*) is written in seven acts. The theme is a political intrigue between Rāshīsa the minister of the Nāandas and Cāmilva the great politician, who succeeded in overthrowing the Nāandas and winning Rāshīsa to the side of Candragupta. The style of Visaladattī marks a distinct falling off from the lucid diction of Kālidāsa and the grandeur of Bhavabhūti. In fact, the style of Visaladattī is highly artificial.

Vīmana and Ānandavardhana quote from the work of Bhāttānārayana who probably flourished in the eighth century A.D. His only drama (*Nāṭaka*) *Venisamhara*,

Vīśiṣṭha
datta
Mudrā
rākṣī

Bhāttāna
rāyana
Veni
sā
māhāta

written in *six* acts, is based on the story of the *Mahābhārata* Bhīma kills Duḥśāsana and ties the braid of Draupadī with his blood. Ultimately he succeeds in killing Duryodhana also. Bhattanārāyana is undoubtedly a remarkable craftsman among later Sanskrit dramatists, he is particularly adept in describing the Heroic sentiment. The first three acts of the *Venīsamhāra* are full of action, and the predominant emotion is enthusiasm (*utsāha*). The poet has also very successfully illustrated the manifold technicalities of Sanskrit dramaturgy in his drama.

No other later dramatist was able to dramatize successfully the Rāma-episode, after Bhavabhūti had written his masterpieces. Muīānī who is not an exception to this rule, wrote his *Anaīghaīāghava* sometime about the beginning of the ninth century A D. The drama (Nātaka) is written in *seven* acts, and the style is clear.

Rājaśekhara was the reputed teacher of King Mahendrapāla of Kanauj (893-907 A D.) Among his many works, Rājaśekhara has written *four* dramas. The *Bālārāmāyana* is a drama (Nātaka) in *ten* acts, dealing with the life-history of Rama. The *Bālabhārata* is an incomplete drama (Nātaka) of which *two*

acts only are available. The *Karpuramanañjari*, a play (Sattika) in four acts is written in Prâkrit. The *Viddhasalabhañjala* is also a drama (Natika) in four acts. Rajsekhara's style is highly artificial, but the dramatist himself claims to be a great poet.

The *Candalauñjala* of Ksemisvara is a drama (Natika) in five acts. The author wrote this play for King Mahipala of Kannauj whose accession to the throne took place in 914 A.D. The plot of this drama is the famous story of King Hariscandra and sage Visvamitra. The style of this drama also is highly artificial.

Damodaramisra wrote his *Mahanatala* or *Hanumannataka* in the eleventh century A.D. The drama is found in three recensions separately containing nine, ten and fourteen acts. The plot is based on the *Ramayana*, and the dramatist shows considerable skill in versification.

The date of the *Prabodhacandrodaya*, an allegorical drama, written by Krsnamisra is the fourteenth century A.D. The characters of this drama are represented by such characters as Viveka, Manas, Buddhi, etc. This drama is a solitary instance where the Quietistic sentiment has been represented on

Kṣemis
vara
Canda
kausika

Damodara
m a
M hā
n t ka

Kṛṣṇa
misra
Prabodha
candrodaya

the stage. The drama (Nātaka) contains six acts, and the style is simple.

E

LESS IMPORTANT DRAMAS

<i>Bhagavadajjukīya</i>	by Bodhāyanakavī—sometime between the first and the fourth century A D written with the purpose of throwing a fling against Buddhism a Pīṭhasana in two acts
<i>Tāpasavatsaījacarita</i>	by Anangahaiṣa Mātralāja—Dr Keith fixes the age of the <i>Ratnāvalī</i> as the upper limit of the work based on a variation of the theme of Vatsarāja, Padmāvatī and Vāsavadattā
<i>Lokānanda</i>	ascribed to Candīa or Candiāka(?) who is identified with Candra-gomin, the grammarian, of the seventh century A D
<i>Udāttarāughava</i>	by Māyurāja who appears to have known Bhavabhūti and is referred to by Rājaśekhara
<i>Svapnadasānana</i>	by Bhīmata—mentioned by Rājaśekhara
<i>Dharmābhuyudaya</i>	by Meghapiṭabhācāīya—a shadow-drama of unknown date
<i>Kārnasundari</i>	by Bilhana of the eleventh century A D—a Nātikā

<i>Citrabhārata</i>	by Keemendra of the eleventh century A D—a lost drama
<i>Prabuddharauhineya</i>	by Rīmabhadra Muni of the twelfth century A D—in six acts
<i>Kaumudimitrānanda</i>	by Rīmacandra of the twelfth century A D—a Prakarana in ten acts
<i>Latakamelaka</i>	by Sankhadhara Kavirāja of the twelfth century A D—a Prahasana
<i>Mudritakumudacandra</i>	by Yasascandra of the twelfth century A D—a Jinistic drama
<i>Nirbhayabhumavyāyoga</i>	by Rīmacandra a prolific Jaina dramatist belonging to the twelfth century A D
<i>Kiratārjuniya</i> <i>Rukminīharana</i> <i>Tripuradāha</i> <i>Samudramathana</i> <i>Karpūracarita & Hāsyacudāmanī</i>	by Vatsarāja of the twelfth century A D—the first a Vyāyoga the second an Īhīmīga in four acts the third a Dīma in four acts the fourth a Samavākīra in three acts the fifth a Bhīna and the sixth a farce (Prahasana) one act
<i>Parthaparākrama</i>	by Prahlīdanadeva of the twelfth century A D—a Vyāyoga
<i>Prasannarāghava</i>	by Jayadeva (of Berar) of the twelfth century A D—based on the <i>Rāmāyaṇa</i> —a Nītaka in seven acts
<i>Harakelinātaka</i>	by Viśladeva Vigrahārāja of the twelfth century A D—partially preserved in stone
<i>Kundamālā</i>	ascribed to Dīgnīga—but according to some written by Dhi

	janāga—quoted in the <i>Sāhitya-daipana</i> —not later than the thirteenth century A D
<i>Dūtūngada</i>	by Subhata of the thirteenth century A D a shadow-play
<i>Hammīamadamaidana</i>	by Jayasimha of the thirteenth century A D—in five acts
<i>Moharūjaparūjaya</i>	by Yaśahpāla of the thirteenth century A D an allegorical drama in five acts
<i>Vikrīntakauava</i> & <i>Maithilīkalyāna</i>	by Hastimalla of the thirteenth century A D in six and five acts respectively
<i>Pūrvatīparīnaya</i>	attributed to Bāna, but allotted to Vāmana Bhaṭṭa Bāna of the fourteenth century A D
<i>Saugandhikākāvana</i>	by Viśvanātha of the fourteenth century A D—a Vyāyoga
<i>Dhūritasamāgama</i>	by Kavīśekhaṇa of the fifteenth century A D a Prahasana
<i>Caitanyacandīodaya</i>	by Kavikānapūra of the sixteenth century A D
<i>Vidagdhamādhava</i> & <i>Lalitamādhava</i>	by Rūpagosvāmin of the sixteenth century A D—dealing with the attractive Kīṣna legend—in seven and ten acts respectively
<i>Kamsavadha</i>	by Sesakīṣna of the seventeenth century A D—in seven acts
<i>Jūnakīparīnaya</i>	by Rāmabhadrā Dīksita of the seventeenth century A D
<i>Mallikīmīrīuta</i>	by Uddandīn of the seventeenth century A D—a Piakāvana

<i>Abhutadarpana</i>	by Mahīdeva contemporary of Rīmabhadra—in ten acts
<i>Hāsyānata</i>	by Jagadīvara of unknown date—a Prahasana
<i>Kautukasariasiā</i>	by Gopinītha of unknown date —a Prahasana
<i>Unmattarāghaīa</i>	by Bhīskara of unknown date— an Aṅka
<i>Madhavasādhana</i> (and other plays)	} by Nītyagopīḥi Kaviratna of the nineteenth century A.D
<i>Amaramangala</i>	by Paśicīnna Tīrīratna of the latter half of the nineteenth cen- tury A.D and the first half of the twentieth century A.D—in eight acts

REFERENCES

Ayyar A S P Two plays of Bhīṣa

Borooh A Bhavabhūti—his place in Sanskrit
Literature

Basu Chandranath *Sakuntalītattva*

Basu Devendranath *Sakuntalīy Nītyakalī*

Belvalkar S K (i) Origin of Indian Drama (The
Calcutta Review May 1929)
(ii) *Uttarārīmacarita* (HOS)

Bhandarkar R G *Mīlatimīdhava*

Buhler G On the authorship of the *Rātnīvali*
(IA Vol II)

Chatterjee Bankim Chandra *Vividhaprabandha*

Chatterjee N *Miechakatika* a study

Devadhar C R Plays ascribed to Bhīṣa their
authenticity and merits

Gajendragadkari, A B The Venisamhāra—a critical study

Kāle M R (i) Abhijñānaśakuntala
(ii) Uttarāraśamacarita

Keith A B (i) The Sanskrit Drama
(ii) JRAS 1909

Kulkarni, K P Sanskrit Drama and Dramatist

Konow, S IA Vol. XLIII (on Viśākhādatta)

Konow, S & Lanmann, C R Karpūlamāñjari (HOS)

Levi, S Le Théâtre Indien

Macdonell A A A History of Sankrit Literature

Naiman, G K, & Jackson A V W Piyyadarśikā

Pishiaotī, A K Bhāsa's works—a criticism

Pusalkar, A D Bhāsa a study

Rapson, E JRAS 1900, (on Viśākhadatta)

Ridgeway (i) The Origin of Tragedy
(ii) Dramas and Dramatic Dances of Non-European Races

Sāstīn Ashokanath (i) Prācīnbhāiate Dīśya-kāvyaotpatti Itihāsa (Bhāratavāsa, B S 1333-34)
(ii) Bhāratīyanātyer Vedamūlakatā
(iii) Bhāratīyanātyer Pracīnatā (Māsik Vasumatī, B S 1345-46)
(iv) Abhinayadarśana of Nandikeśvara

Sāstīn T G Bhāsa's works—a critical study

Tagore, Rabindranath Prācīn Sāhitya

Vidyābhūṣana, S C Date of Ratnāvalī

Weber, A The History of Indian Literature

Wilson, H H Theatre of the Hindus

Winteritz, M Some Problems of Indian Literature

Yajnik, R K The Indian Theatre

CHAPTER SIX

LYRIC POETRY

A

INTRODUCTION

Classical Sanskrit literature is highly rich in lyrical poetry. Though it is a fact that Classical lyric poetry has not produced many works of respectable length and size yet none would deny that its merit is usually of a high order. Lyrical poets have often been successful in depicting the amorous feeling with a few artistic strokes, and their compositions can very well stand comparison with those of foreign poets. The range of lyrical literature in Sanskrit is very wide. It is not confined to the theme of love and amorous feeling only. It includes secular, religious, gnomic and didactic poems and thus offers a variety which is sufficient to remove monotony.

In all lyrical poems dealing with love, Nature plays a very important part. The intimate relation between Nature and Man has not in all probability found a more charming expression in any other branch of

Extent of
Sanskrit
lyrics

Nature in
Sanskrit
lyrics

literature. The lotus and the lily, the Cakora, the Cakravāka and the Cātaka, all are inseparably connected with human life and love in its different phases.

It is further to be noted that Pākñit literature is also highly rich in lyrical poetry. The *Sattasai* or *Gāthāsaptaśatī* attributed to Sātavāhana is an outstanding work of this type. The book is a collection of seven hundred verses in Pākñit dealing with various phases of the sentiment of love. Bāna refers to this work in his *Hāsiacarita*. Professor Macdonell wants to place it before 1000 A.D. If, on the other hand, Hāla or Sātavāhana, to whom the work is attributed, is taken as a king of that name of the Andhra dynasty, the work must be placed early in the Christian era.

Prākñit
lyrics

B

GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT OF LYRIC POETRY

Meghadūta

The name of Kālidāsa stands high in the realm of Sanskrit lyrical poetry. There is no gainsaying the fact that his *Meghadūta* which has been unsuccessfully imitated

times without number by later poets,¹ is the finest flower of Classical lyric poetry. The lyric has inspired poets like Goethe and Rabindranath who have lavishly bestowed their praise upon this magic personality in literature. Fancifully the poet makes a cloud the messenger of the message of love and admiration to the beloved of a banished Yaksī, who had been pining for him during the rainy season at Alaka. The work is divided into two sections known as the *Purvamegha* and the *Uttaramegha*. The poem is written in Mundakranta metre of gorgeous rhythm like the roar of a July cloud weary under the burden of its water. This is also quite in keeping with the sublime conception of love which, tinged with the burning colour of separation, resembles a black cloud with a silver lining. The stanzas containing the words of message are the most poignant and beautiful in literature and the lyric will ever stand impressed on our memory like a rainbow springing from the earth.

Vedāntadeśika's *Hamsasandeśa* (of the thirteenth century A.D.) Rūpagosvīmin's *Hamsadūta* (of the fifteenth century A.D.) Kṛṣṇānanda's *Padunkadūta* (of the seventeenth century A.D.) are some of the more well known Dūtakāvya-s.

The book has been translated into various European languages and Schiller's *Maria Stuart* owes its origin to it

Rtusamhāra The *Rtusamhāra* is the second lyric of Kālidāsa. It is a short poem in six cantos describing all the six seasons of the year. It is undoubtedly an earlier production of the poet and though Kālidāsa's authorship of this poem is doubted by many scholars,¹ still we can find in it the aspirations of a budding poet.²

Ghata-karpara Tradition makes Ghatakarpara one of the nine gems in the court of King Vikramāditya. The *Ghatakarpara-hāvya* after the name of the poet is written in twenty-two stanzas. It describes how a young wife in the beginning of the rains sends a cloud-messenger to her absent husband. The poem abounds in Yamakas (figure of speech) for which the author feels proud.

Bhartrhari Bhartrhari has to his credit the three Satakas (collection of a hundred verses), viz., (a) the *Śringārasatka* (b) the *Nītisatka*

¹ Professors Kielhorn, Buhler, Macdonell, Schroeder and others accept the authorship of Kālidāsa while other scholars entertain a different view.

² See, Aurobinda Ghosh, Kālidāsa, Gajendragadkar, *Rtusamhāra*

and (c) the *Vaṇagyaśatala*. The single authorship of these three poems is doubted by some scholars, but Indian tradition accepts Bhartrhari to be their author. Bhartrhari is said to have died in 651 A.D.¹ All the three poems are written in a very lucid style and they have the greatest interest to them for whom they are intended.

Mayūra was a contemporary of Bana bhattacharya of the seventh century A.D., and reported to be his father in law. His *Sūryaśatala*² is a religious lyric in one hundred verses written in honour of the Sun. Tradition says that the poet was cured of leprosy by composing this eulogy of the Sun.³

It is impossible to ascertain the date of Amaru Vāmanā (800 A.D.) is the earliest writer who quotes three verses from the *Amaruśataka*, a lyrical poem in one hundred

Mayūra
Sūryasataka

Amaru
Amaru
sataka

¹ It is yet to be decided whether the author of the *Satakas* is the same person as the famous grammarian of that name who wrote the *Vākyapadiya*.

There are other *Sūryasatakas* by different poets which do not deserve any special mention.

Vajradatta a Buddhist poet of the ninth century A.D. composed his *Lokesvarasataka* and was cured of leprosy.

stanzas¹ describing the conditions of women at different stages of life and love. The poet is really gifted and his delineation of sentiments and emotions, especially of love, is superb in character. His style is difficult, but certainly graceful. Amaru's poem has found the widest recognition in the hands of Sanskrit rhetoricians and he is quoted by great thinkers on poetry like Ānandavardhana. The poem has been commented on by more than a dozen writers including Ājunaśarman (1215 A.D.)

The *Carīapañcasikā* of Bilhana is a lover's recollections of the sweet company of his beloved. The poem contains fifty stanzas. The date of the poet is 1076 A.D. 1127 A.D. Bhāratacandra, a Bengali poet of the eighteenth century A.D., drew the inspiration of his popular poem 'Vidyāsundarā' from this work of Bilhana.

The Kṛṣṇa-legend found a poetical interpreter in Jayadeva, the last great name in Sanskrit poetry, who flourished in Bengal during the reign of King Laksmanasena of the twelfth century A.D. He was the son of Bhojadeva of Kendubilva. His poem, the

Bilhana
Caurapañ-
casikā

Jayadeva
Gitagovinda

¹ The text of the poem has come down to us in four recensions which vary widely among themselves.

Gitagovinda ranks high amongst Sanskrit lyrics and the poet is a gifted master of poetry. According to Professor Macdonell the poem marks a transitional period between pure lyric and pure drama¹. Sir William Jones calls it a small pastoral drama while Professor Lassen regards it as a lyrical drama. Leopold von Schroeder would look upon it as a refined Yatra. Both Professors Pischel and Levi place it in the category between song and drama. Some Indian scholars maintain that the poem is a court epic.

Dhoyi a contemporary of Jayadeva, graced the court of King Lakshmanasa. Like other Dūtakāvya-s, his poem, the *Pavana duta* is written in imitation of the *Meghaduta*.

Dhoyi
Pavanaduta

C

LESSER LYRIC POEMS AND ANTHOLOGIES

Singarati laka attributed to Kālidāsa—containing attractive pictures of love in twenty three stanzas

Bhaktamarastotra by Minatunga probably a contemporary of Bīma or earlier—

¹ It is probable that the poet took as his model popular plays representing incidents from the life of Kṛiṣṇa as the modern Yātrās in Bengal still do.

Bhallaṭa Śataka by Bhallaṭa a junior contemporary of Īnandavardhana—a gnomic poem

Mahimnaḥstotra by Puṣpadanta not later than the ninth century A D—a religious lyric

Subhūṣitaratnasandoha } by Anūtagati of the tenth century A D—all didactic poems
Dharmaparikṣā & Yogasāra } of the tenth century A D—all didactic poems

Kṛṣṇakarṇīmṛta } by Bīrvamāṅgala or Lalīsukī of & Vṛndāvanastuti } the eleventh century A D—highly popular and of graceful style

Samayamāṭrīkā
Kālāśīlaśa Darpadalana
Seiyaserakopadesa
Caturīrgasamgraha &
Cārucaryāśataka } by Kṣemendra of Kīshīr—all didactic poems

Kaṇḍraśīacanasamuccaya an anthology—of the eleventh century A D

Anyoktimuktulatasātaka by Sambhu who wrote under Harsa of Kīshīr (1089 A D—1101 A D)—a gnomic poem

Āryasaptasati by Govardhana a contemporary of Jayadeva—containing seven hundred erotic stanzas—written after the *Sattasai* of Hīla

Yogaśūtra
Vitarūgastotra &
Mahīvraśotra } by Hemacandra of the twelfth century A D—very good didactic lyric poems sometimes reminding us of the poems of Bhartibhārī

Saduktīlarnīmṛta an anthology by Śridhara of the twelfth century A D

logy aided by environment and the course of events. The popular Indian view on worldly life and the teachings of Indian philosophical and religious works are surely responsible for fostering a feeling of apathy towards making any serious attempt at recording facts and dwelling on them.

The beginnings of Indian history are to be traced to the *Purāṇas* which contain amidst vast masses of religious and social matters, accounts of genealogies which are the very germs of history.

In *Prākrit*, however, there is a very important historical work called the *Gaudavaho* which was written by Vākpati. It celebrates the defeat of one Gauda king by Yaśovarman, King of Kanauj, the poet's patron, who was again overthrown by Lalitāditya Muktagīda, King of Kāshī. Vākpati is a follower of the Gauda style and uses long compounds. His date has approximately been fixed in the eighth century A.D., and he is mentioned along with Bhavabhūti.

B

GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF HISTORICAL WORKS

Padmagupta also known as Pāṇmala, wrote his *Navasāhasrākacarita* in 1050

Earliest
Historical
works

Vākpati
Gaudavaho

A.D. The book contains *eighteen* cantos and describes the winning of Princess Sisipraba and also alludes to the history of Simdhujaya Navasishasana of Malava

Padma
gupta
N^o vas ha
s^o nkarita

Sandhyālakanandin's *Ramapalacarita* describes through *double entendre* the story of Rama and also the history of King Ramapala of Bengal who recovered his ancestral home from Bhima, a Kshavita chief and conquered Mithila. Sandhyālakanandin flourished during 1057 A.D.—1087 A.D.

Sandhyā
karanan
din Rama
pālacakarita

Bilhana's patron was Vilramaditya VI a Calukya king of Kalyana who flourished during 1076 A.D.—1127 A.D. Bilhana glorified his patron by writing his *Vilramakhadevacarita* in *eighteen* cantos. Bilhana was more a poet than a historian and his work abounds in numerous imaginary and fanciful descriptions.

Bilhana
Vikramān
kadeva
carita

Kalhana is the best of Indian historians. He wrote his *Rajatarangini* in 1100 A.D. Kalhana has derived materials for his book from older sources including the *Nilamatapura*. The *Rajatarangini* is the only reliable book on the history of Kashmīr after the death of King Harsha when the country passed through stormy bloody days. Though a historian Kalhana has the rare

Kalhana
Rajataran
gini

gifts of a poet, and his book is a wonderful admixture of poetic fancy and historical facts. According to European scholars, it is the only work in Sanskrit literature which approaches history to a certain extent.

Hemacandra who flourished during 1088 A.D. 1172 A.D. wrote his *Kumārapālacarita* or *Dvyāśayakāvya* in honour of Kumārapāla, King of the Cālukyas.

The anonymous *Prthvīrājavijaya* celebrates the victories of King Prthvīrāja over Shihāb-ud-dīn Ghori in 1191 A.D.

Hema-
candra
Kumāra-
pālacarita

Prthvīrāja-
vijaya

C

MINOR HISTORICAL WORKS

Prabhāvakacarita by Prabhācandra and revised by Pradyumnaśūla (1277 A.D.)—regarded as a continuation of Hemacandra's *Pariśista-parvan*—containing the life-history of twenty-two Jaina teachers—a semi-historical work.

Rūjendrakānapūra by Śambhu who wrote in honour of Harsadeva of Kāshmīr (1089 A.D. 1101 A.D.)

Kīrtikāumudi } by Someśvara adatta (1179 A.D.—
& *Swāthotsava* } 1262 A.D.)—more in the form of panegyrics—the latter written in fifteen cantos

<i>Sukṛitasaṅkīrtana</i>	by Arisimha of the thirteenth century A D—a panegyric in eleven cantos
<i>Jagadūcarita</i>	by Sarvānanda of unknown date—a panegyric of a Jaina who rendered help to his townsfolk at the time of the famine of 12568 A D in Gujarat
<i>Prabandha-cintāmaṇi</i>	by Merutunga of the fourteenth century A D—a quasi historical biographical work
<i>Prabandha-kosa</i>	by Rājasekhara of the fourteenth century A D—containing the life stories of Jaina teachers poets kings and other personages
<i>Kṛtilata</i>	by Vidyāpati of the fourteenth century A D

REFERENCES

Keith A B A History of Sanskrit Literature
 Macdonell A A A History of Sanskrit Literature
 Weber A The History of Indian Literature
 Winternitz M A History of Indian Literature
 Vol II

CHAPTER EIGHT

PROSE LITERATURE

A

INTRODUCTION

In matters of expression the Indian mind has always preferred poetry to prose. Commentaries and lexicons were written in verse, and sometimes conversation even was carried on in metre. The major portion of Vedic literature is in metre. So the peculiarity of the Indian mind is the cause of the dearth of prose literature in Sanskrit. In the *Krṣṇa-Yajurveda*, however, we come across the earliest specimen of prose-writing. The prose of the *Atharvaveda* should also be considered in connection with the study of the history and development of prose-writings in ancient India. The prose of the Brāhmaṇas is simple yet elegant, and the prose of the Sūkta literature is more or less in the form of a message we usually send in a telegram. All these, however, cannot give us any standard of writing which may be imitated with profit. The prose portions of the *Mahābhārata*, and of the Pūrāṇas such as, the *Viṣṇu* and the

Bhagavata and of the medical compilations of Cūaka and Susruta should also be mentioned. The earliest standard of prose writing is to be found in Patañjali's *Mahabhaṣya* which is noted for its grace, vigour and elegance and in it we find a perfection of Brahmanical prose. The prose of explanatory treatises or commentaries offers a good specimen of Sanskrit composition. Thus the writings of Śibiṇiśvāmin on the *Mimamsasutras* of Vatsyāyana on the *Nyayasutras* the commentaries of Saṅkha on the *Brahmasutras* and the *Upaniṣads* and the explanatory work of Medhātithi on *Manu-smṛti* are instances to the point. Besides all these, there is the prose of the early dramatic literature which should necessarily demand a careful study. In fact the extent of prose writing is not very small but when it is said that it is insignificant the greater extent of poetic compositions is considered.

Though the beginnings of Sanskrit prose writings may be traced to a very dim antiquity the extant works on prose literature are of a comparatively late date. The extant prose literature may be divided into two broad classes —romance and fable.

It appears that in early Classical Sans-

κιτ there were numerous types of prose romances, the two most important among them being Ākhyāyikā and Kathā. But as early as the seventh century A.D., Dandin writes in his *Kāvyādarśa* that there is no vital point of difference in the nature of these two types of prose compositions and he regards them as the different names of one and the same species. Amarasiṁha, the lexicographer, however, distinguishes between the two, Ākhyāyikā having a historical basis and Kathā being a purely poetic creation.

The origin of Indian fable literature must be traced back to the earliest times in the life of Vedic Indians. The tales current among the people were later on used for a definite purpose, and the didactic fable became a mode of inculcating useful knowledge.

B

ROMANCE

There is a great difference of opinion amongst scholars regarding the age of Dandin. It is held on the evidence of the *Kāvyādarśa*, a well-known work on rhetorical

canons by the poet, that he flourished after Pravarisen. According to the *Rajata sangini*, Pravarisen ruled Kāshmu in the sixth century A.D. This Pravarisen was probably the author of the poem *Setubandha*. The relation between Dandin and Bhāmīha another rhetorician, has created a great controversy. Some scholars are inclined to believe that Dandin has criticized the views of Bhāmīha while others entertain the opposite view. There is some controversy again with regard to the relation of Dandin to Bhatti the grammarian poet. Some scholars are definitely of opinion that Dandin used the *Bhaṭṭīlāyīa*. It is, however, presumed that he flourished in the seventh century A.D. From the internal evidence furnished by both the *Daśa lumaracarita* and the *Kāryadarśa* it appears that Dandin was an inhabitant of South India. He was fairly acquainted with the Kāverī, the Andhras and the Colas.

Dandin's *Daśa lumaracarita*, a work of the Akhyāyīka type, describes the exploits of eight princes Rajavāhanī and others. As the name of the work implies, it should have contained accounts of ten princes. The stories of the other two princes are given in

the prelude (*Pūrapīthikā*) and the incomplete story of one of the princes (*Visanta*) has been incorporated in the sequel (*Uttarapīthikā*), which two chapters seem to be the work of a different hand. The romance reflects admirably the social conditions in which the author lived and where the standard of morality was markedly poor. Dandin's writings usually conform to the Vaidarbha style.

Subandhu appears to have been earlier than Bāṇabhatta who has referred to the former's *Vāsavadattā* in his introduction to the *Kādambarī*. In a passage in the *Vāsavadattā* Subandhu laments over the death of Vikramāditya. This has led scholars to surmise that after the death of Candragupta II of the Gupta dynasty who assumed the title of Vikramāditya, there was a civil war in the country, and Subandhu was aggrieved by upholding the losing cause. This theory, however, is not generally accepted. From two passages in the *Vāsavadattā*, European scholars find references to Uddyotakāra, the great writer on Nyāya, and the *Bauddhasangatyalankāra* of Dharmakūti. If the allusions are correct, Subandhu may be placed in the beginning of the seventh century A.D.

Subandhu
age & work

The theme of Subindhu's *Vasavadatta* is the love story of Prince Kandupaketu and Princess Vasavadatta. The playful imagination of the poet conceives how on one night the prince dreams about a beautiful princess and starts in quest of her. Meanwhile the princess having dreamt of Prince Kandupaketu sends one of her personal attendants in search of him. Kandupaketu in course of his travels comes to learn about Vasavadatta from the conversation of a pair of birds. He arrives at Pataliputra and is united with Vasavadatta. But the King Vasavadatta's father wants to give her away to another prince. Thereupon the two leave the palace on a magic steed and go to the Vindhya. One night they fall asleep but in the morning the prince gets up and is surprised not to find Vasavadatta by his side. He commences a vigorous search and at last discovers her in the hermitage of the sage. She is turned into a stone and the prince revives her by his touch.

The poet is a master of a style which is marked by a preponderant use of alliteration.

Banabhatta is undoubtedly the greatest of Indian prose writers. Fortunately the

Story of
Vasavadatta

Style

Bāna
age &
works

Harṣa-
carita

Kādambarī

date of Bāna is one of the surest planks in the tottering edifice of ancient Indian chronology. Bāna has to his credit the *Harṣacarita* and the *Kādambarī* which are respectively an *Akhyāyikā* and a *Kathā*.

In his *Harṣacarita*, Bāna glorifies his patron, King Harṣa who flourished during 606 A.D.-647 A.D. In the first and second chapters of this incomplete book Bāna gives an account of his genealogy and early life which reveals him as a great traveller.

Bāna makes lavish use of his poetic imagination in relating the story of *Kādambarī* which also he could not complete. The theme of this book is the fascinating love-story of Candīápīda and Kādambarī in their several births. Running parallel with the main story we also find the love-episode of Pundarīka and Mahāśvetā. The romance relates how the Moon-god being cursed by Pundarīka who was pining for Mahāśvetā, was born on earth as Candīápīda and fell in love with Kādambarī, the Gandharva princess. Pundarīka also cursed by the Moon-god was born on earth as Vaiśampāyana, the friend of Candīápīda. In this birth also both Candīápīda and Vaiśampāyana gave up their lives and were again born as King

Sūdrala and the purot respectively. Happily in this birth they were all reunited.

Much has been said of Bāṇi's style. Western critics describe it as a big forest where all access is prohibited because of the luxuriant undergrowth of words. But Indian scholars have the highest admiration for Bāṇi and his style, and it would not be an exaggeration to say that his style has been regarded by Indian scholars as the standard style of prose. Superb is Bāṇi's power of description and he wields the language with the greatest ease.

Style

C

FABLE

The short stories in Indian literature may be classed under *three* different heads, viz. the popular tales, the beast fables and the fairy tales. The popular tales again may be broadly sub divided into Buddhistic and non Buddhistic.¹

Classification of fables

The Buddhist popular tales are the Pali Jātakas which were current among the

Buddhist popular tales

¹ The fable literature of the Jains is extremely rich. But only a few works are written in pure Sanskrit.

Buddhists from the earliest times. Apart from these Jātaka stories there are some Buddhist Sanskrit works on popular stories (already referred to in a previous chapter).

Gunādhya's *Bṛhatkathā* is an outstanding work among non-Buddhistic popular tales. The work was written in Pāśācī Prākīt, a dialect spoken in the north western parts of India. The work is now unfortunately lost to us, but the story has been preserved in three Sanskrit works, viz., (1) Budhasvāmin's *Ślokasamgraha* (composed between the eighth and the ninth century A.D.), (2) Ksemendra's *Bṛhatkathāmañjari* (1037 A.D.) and (3) Somadeva's *Kathāsarītsāgarā* (1063-81 A.D.). According to Dr. Keith the *Ślokasamgraha* (which is found only in a fragment of twenty-eight chapters and some 4539 verses) is a genuine translation of Gunādhya's work and he holds that both Somadeva's *Kathāsarītsāgarā* (containing 21,388 verses) and Ksemendra's *Bṛhatkathāmañjari* (containing about 7500 verses) are not from the original *Bṛhatkathā*. Nevertheless, the *Bṛhatkathā* is mentioned as early as the seventh century A.D. in Dandin's *Kāvyādarśa*, and Dr. Buhler has placed the

work in the first or the second century A.D. Dr. Keith suggests that it was written not later than the fourth century A.D. The importance of the *Brahmabhatta* can hardly be overestimated. As a perpetual source of inspiration the *Brahmabhatta* occupies an eminent position in Indian literature, a place next only to that of the two Great Epics, the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata*.

The *Pinacalantra* by Visnusvamin is an important work on the beast fable literature and it is said that the book has an earlier basis called the *Tantridhyayika* now lost to us. The work is written in twelve books in clear lucid style with an admixture of prose and verse. It alludes to Cāṇḍilya and follows Kāṇḍilya's *Bṛhatāstra*. The importance of this work may be judged from the fact that it was translated into Pāhlavi and Syriac in the sixth century A.D. into Arabic in the eighth century A.D., into Hebrew in the eleventh century A.D. into Spanish in the thirteenth century A.D. and into Latin and English in the sixteenth century A.D.

The *Hitopadeśa* is another work on beast fable literature written by one Narasimha Pundita. The author imitates the style of Visnusvamin and the method of arran-

Narasimha
Pundita
Hitopadeśa

Narasimha
Hitopadeśa

ment is entirely the same in both the works. The author lived in the court of King Dhavalacandha of whom we know little. A manuscript of this work is dated the fourteenth century A.D. According to Dr. Keith its date cannot be earlier than the eleventh century A.D., as a verse of Rudrabhatta is cited in the book. Moreover a Jaina scholar made use of it in 1199 A.D. in order to produce a new version.

Another work of the beast-fable class is Śrīvara's *Kathākautuka* written in the fifteenth century A.D.

Under the fairy-tale literature we may class the following three books of unknown date. The *Vetālapañcavimsati* attributed to Śivadāsa and the *Simhāsanadvātrimsikā* are probably of the Buddhist origin. Both the books are based on the character of a fictitious king named Vikrama. The *Šukasaptati* of unknown origin and date is a collection of seventy tales which the parrot narrates to the mistress who was about to play false to her husband.

Śrīvara
Kathā-
kautuka

Vetālapañ-
cavimsati,
Simhāsan-
dvātrimsikā
& Šuka-
saptati

D

LESSER PROSE TALES

Upamitibharaprapanañca kathī by Siddha or Siddhar
rī a Juna monk of 906 A D—
written in prose interspersed with
verses—a didactic tale

Katharnava by Śivadīva—containing *thirty five*
tales chiefly of fools and thieves—
of unknown date but appearing as
a late work

Purusaparikṣī by Vidyāpīti belonging to the latter
part of the fourteenth century
A D—containing *forty four* stories

Bhojaprabandha by Ballīlāsena of the sixteenth
century A D—containing legends
of the court of King Bhoja

Campakāgreśīkathunaka } by Jinakirti of the
& *Palagopālakathunaka* } fifteenth century A D
Kathākosa of unknown date—written in bad Sanskrit
Samyaktiāumudi by an unknown author—pro
bably of a later date

REFERENCES

Keith A B A History of Sanskrit Literature
Macdonell A A A History of Sanskrit Literature
Weber A The History of Indian Literature

CHAPTER NINE

CAMPŪ LITERATURE

A

INTRODUCTION

Campū character & age

Composition in mixed prose and verse in Sanskrit is called Campū. Though the admixture of prose and verse can be traced even in Vedic literature, specially in the Brāhmaṇas, still the origin of Campū is to be sought in its immediate predecessors, the fables and the romances. Already in the writings of Subandhu and Bāna and in some inscriptions we find stray verses, until very lately the mingling of prose and verse became a singular characteristic of a different section of literature. But it is a curious fact that no Campū older than the tenth century A D is extant, though Professor Oldenbourg has discovered something like Campū in the *Jātakamālā* of Āryaśūra.

B

SOME IMPORTANT WORKS

Nalacampū &) by Tūrvikiamabhatta of the tenth
Madālasūccampū) century A D

Yaśastilaka by Somadeva a Digambara Jaina of the middle of the tenth century A D —describing the conversion of King Mīridatta

Tilakamañjari by Dhanapāla a Jaina who wrote about 970 A D

Jīvandharacampū by Haricandra not earlier than 900 A D

Pumīyanacampū attributed to Bhojarāja and Laksanabhatta

Bhūratacarpu by Ananta of unknown date

Udayasundarikathā by Soddhala of 1040 A D — highly influenced by Bīna

Gopālacampū by Jivagosvīmin of the sixteenth century A D

Sīhāsudhāharacampū by Nārīyana of the seventeenth century A D

Śankaracetovilāsacampū by Sankara—a very late work

REFERENCES

Keith A B A History of Sanskrit Literature
 Winternitz M A History of Indian Literature Vol II

The most popular of all the schools of grammar is that of Pāṇini who has mentioned no less than *sixty four* names of previous grammarians among which Kasyapa Āpisali, Gārgya, Gālava, Sakatavāna Senala and Sphotayana may be cited

Pāṇini &
his prede-
cessors

B

PĀNINI SCHOOL

Scholars vary widely among themselves in determining the age of Pāṇini. Professor Goldstucker places him in the eighth century B.C., while Professors Max Müller and Weber are of opinion that he belonged to the fourth century B.C. His grammar, the *Aṣṭadhyāyī* is a work in *eight* chapters each of which contains *four* sections. The arrangement of the rules is highly scientific, economy being the most outstanding characteristic.

Pāṇini
Aṣṭadhyāyī

informs us that the Aindra school was supplanted by Pāṇini the author of the *Aṣṭadhyāyī*. This has led Dr Burnell to conclude that the Aindra school of grammar is the oldest in India. It should be noted however that neither Pāṇini nor Patañjali mentions Indra as a grammarian. It is therefore argued by some that the Aindra school is post Pāṇiniya in date though pre Pāṇiniya in substance.

Kātyāyana who is known as the Vāittikākāra came after Pānini and his age is usually assigned to the third century B.C. The Vāittikas are undoubtedly 'supplementary rules' which were framed by Kātyāyana to justify certain new forms which crept into the language after Pānini had written his Sūtras. But Kātyāyana did not only supplement the rules of Pānini but also rejected some of them which were deemed unnecessary. In some cases again he improved upon the text of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* to meet the demands of a living language.

Patañjali who is regarded as the 'last of the 'three great sages', lived during the reign of King Pusyamitīa (or Puspamitīa) of the Śunga dynasty. His date is one of the few definite landmarks in the whole range of early Indian literature. Patañjali earned for himself a rare reputation and his views were referred to by later schools of rival philosophers with utmost respect and reverence. Patañjali resorted to some technical devices whereby he could effectively extend the scope of the original Sūtras of Pānini and did not on that account venture any addition like Kātyāyana. It must, however, be said that he, too, rejected quite a good

number of the Sūtras of Panini. The prose of Patañjali's *Mahabhaṣya*, is inimitable and marked by the qualities of grace, brevity and perspicuity.

Next after the three great sages mentioned above, one must remember the name of Bhartrhui who is often wrongly identified with Bhatti, the grammarian poet, and who is in all probability referred to by I tsing when he says that a great grammarian died in 651 AD. Bhartrhui is known as the author of the *Vakyapadiya* (in two chapters), the *Prakarana* and a commentary on Patañjali's *Mahabhaṣya* fragments of which are preserved in the Berlin library. It may be proved on the strength of the internal evidence furnished by the *Vakyapadiya* that the grammarian lived earlier than the seventh century AD. The opening chapter of the *Vakyapadiya* discusses the philosophy of Sanskrit grammar. In the second chapter and the *Prakarana*, he discusses various topics of Sanskrit grammar.

Vasmana and Jayaditya are the two Buddhist writers who wrote the *Kāśikā* a commentary on the Sūtras of Panini. I tsing informs us that Jayaditya died about

Bhartrhui
Vakya
padiya and
other works

Vasmana &
Jayaditya
Kāśikā

660 A D The object of Vāmana and Jayāditya was to incorporate in the system of Pānini all the improvements made by Candragomin. The *Kāśikā* is usually known as the *Vṛtti*.

Jinendrabuddhi, a Bengali Buddhist, wrote an excellent and exhaustive commentary called the *Nyāsa* or the *Kāśikāvivaraṇapañjikā*, on the *Kāśikā* of Vāmana and Jayāditya. Jinendrabuddhi is referred to by Bhāmaha, the rhetorician, and as such he cannot be later than the eighth century A D.

Kaiyata is one of the most authoritative writers affiliated to the school of Pānini. His commentary, the *Pradīpa*, on the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali, is an invaluable treatise. It is believed that Kaiyata wrote in the eleventh century A D.

Haiadatta, the author of the *Pada-maṇjari*, a commentary of the *Kāśikā*, is well-known for his independent views which more often than not contradict the statements of Patañjali. Haiadatta is quoted by Mallinātha while he himself quotes Māgha. It is assumed that Haiadatta flourished in the twelfth century A D.

The *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pānini was remoulded

by later grammarians belonging to the school of Panini who arranged the Sūtras of Panini according to the topics selected for discussion Rāmācandra who flourished in the first half of the fifteenth century AD wrote his *Pralayalaumudi* which is supposed to be the model for Bhāttoji's *Siddhāntalaumudi*. The most famous commentary the *Prasada*, on the *Pralayalaumudi* was written by Vīthūlīcārya in the first half of the sixteenth century AD.

The *Siddhāntalaumudi* of Bhāttoji is a treatise of the Sūtras of Panini in the topical method. Bhāttoji flourished in seventeenth century AD. Bhāttoji himself wrote a commentary on his *Siddhāntalaumudi* which is called the *Praudhamanorama*. His *Sabdalauṭubha* is an authoritative commentary on Pāṇini's *Āṭadhyayā*. It is true that Bhāttoji's reputation as an authority on Sanskrit grammar is enviable. The most famous commentary on the *Siddhāntalaumudi* is the *Tattvabodhī* by Jñānendriya Sarasvati of the eighteenth century AD. The *Balamanorama* of Vāsudeva is an easy commentary on the *Siddhāntalaumudi*.

Nāgēśabhatta was a versatile genius of the

Rāma
candra
Prakriya
kaumudi

Bhāttoji
Siddhānta
kaumudi &
other works

eighteenth century A.D. who wrote treatises not only on grammar but also on Yoga, *Alaṅkāra* and other subjects. Among his important works in grammar are the *Uddyota*, a commentary on Kātyāyaṇa's *Pradīpa*, the *Brhacchabdenḍuśekhara* and the *Laghusabdenḍuśekhara* (both commentaries on Bhattoji's *Siddhāntakaumudī*) and the *Pariibhāṣenduśekhara*, a collection of *Pariibhāṣās* in connection with Pāṇini's grammar. The *Vaiyākaranasiddhāntamañjūṣā* (*Brhat* and *Laghu*) is another outstanding work which has discussed various topics of Sanskrit grammar.¹

Vaiadarāja, a very recent writer popularized his name by making abridgements of the *Siddhāntakaumudī*. His two books, the *Laghussiddhāntakaumudī* and the *Madhyasiddhāntakaumudī* are widely read by all beginners of Sanskrit grammar.

C

OTHER IMPORTANT SCHOOLS OF GRAMMAR

Candragomin flourished in the middle of the fifth century A.D. Bhāṭṛhāṇi in his

¹ According to the tradition which we have been privileged to inherit and which comes down uninterruptedly from Nāgeśabhatta, the *Pāṇamalaghumañjūṣā* is not the work of Nāgeśa.

Talgapadiga refers to the Candra school of grammarians. The object of Candra gomin was to recurring with marked brevity the system of Panini. The Candra grammar however gained much popularity and was widely commented upon. The commentaries are now preserved mostly in Tibetan translations.

According to Professor Pithak Juncendri flourished in the latter part of the fifth century A.D. Juncendri's originality inasmuch as he condenses Panini and the Varttikas. Two main commentaries on this grammar have been preserved—one by Abhayamundi (750 A.D.) and another called *Sabdarnavacandrika* by Somadeva.

Sakatayana the founder of a school after his name should not be confused with the ancient Sakatayana mentioned by Panini. Sakatayana wrote his *Sabdamuasana* in the first quarter of the ninth century A.D. *Amoghavartti* is another work of this author. Sakatayana has based his work upon Panini, Katyayana and Juncendri. Sakatayana is also credited with the authorship of (i) the *Paribhasasutras* (ii) the *Ganapatha* (iii) the *Dhatupatha* (iv) the *Unadisutras* and (v) the *Linganusasana*.

Candra
school

Juncendri
school

Sakatayana
school

Hemacandra, the prolific Jaina writer, wrote his *Sabdānuśāsana* in the eleventh century A.D. The book consists of more than *four thousand* Sūtras, and is a compilation rather than an original work. Hemacandra himself wrote a commentary of his book known as *Sabdānuśāsana-bhādiṛtti*.

Saivavarmaṇ is the author of the *Kātantrāsūtras* otherwise known as the Kaumāra and the Kālāpa. The beginnings of this school go to the early centuries of the Christian era. There are, however, evidences of later interpolations in the *Kātantrāsūtras*. Saivavarmaṇ's views are in many places different from those of Pāṇini. Durgasimha wrote his famous *Vṛtti* on this grammar not later than the ninth century A.D. Durgasimha's *Vṛtti* was commented by Vaidhamāna in the eleventh century A.D. Prthvīdhara wrote a sub-commentary on Vaidhamāna's work. The Kātantrā school has been highly popular in Bengal and Kāshmu.

Anubhūtisvarūpācārya is the author of the *Sārasvatapralīyā*, who flourished in the middle of the fourteenth century A.D. Brevity of expression is a characteristic of

this school. Some of the many commentators on the *Sarasvatapriya*, viz. Puñjraja, Amṛtabhārati, Kṣemendri and others

Vopadeva wrote his *Mugdhabodha* in the thirteenth century A.D. Vopadeva's style is brief and simple. His technical terms in many places differ from those of Panini. Ramā Turkuṇagīra is the most celebrated commentator of this grammar.

Mugdha
bodha
school

Kāmadīsvāra wrote his *Sāmīśptasāra* in the thirteenth century A.D. The work has eight sections and the illustrations have been taken from the *Bhaṭṭīlāyī*. The *Sāmīśptasāra* underwent a thorough revision in the hand of Jumūrāṇḍī who wrote a commentary called the *Rasārati*. This grammar is widely read in Western Bengal.

Jaumara
school

The author of the *Supadma* is Pṛadīpanābha who flourished in the fourteenth century A.D. This system of grammar, like many other systems, is based on Panini. Pṛadīpanābha himself wrote a commentary known as the *Supadmapañjīlī*.

Saupadma
school

D

SECTARIAN SCHOOLS OF GRAMMAR

In recent centuries there flourished some grammarians who wanted to make grammar

the vehicle of religion. This tendency was already present in Vopadeva Rūpagosvāmin who wrote his *Harināmāmita* in the fifteenth century A.D. The names of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā are used as actual technical terms of grammar. Jīvagosvāmin wrote a grammar of the same name. A third Vaiṣṇava grammar named *Caitanyāmṛta* is mentioned by Professor Colebrooke.

E

SOME IMPORTANT WORKS ON GRAMMER

Dvighatavṛtti by Śāraṇadeva—a Bengali Buddhist of the twelfth century A.D.—dealing with derivations of difficult words

Bhāṣāvṛtti by Purusottamadeva of the twelfth century A.D.—a commentary on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (sections on Vedic accent are left out)

Ganarātnamahodadhi by Vaidhamāna in 1140 A.D.

Paribhāṣāvṛtti by Śāraṇadeva—a collection of *pari-*
bhāṣās with their explanation

Dhātuprādīpa by Maitreyarakṣita who is later than Hemacandra—containing a list of roots and their uses

Dhātuvṛtti by Mādhaba, son of Śāyaṇa—written after the model of the *Dhātuprādīpa*

<i>Vaiyakaranaabhūṣana</i> & <i>Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣanāśā</i>	by Kaundabhatta ne phew of Bhaṭṭoji—deal ing with philosophical and other points of Sanskrit grammar
<i>Śabdaratna</i>	by Hāṇḍikṣita grandson of Bhaṭṭoji and teacher of Nīgeṇa—a commen tary on the <i>Prauḍhamanoram</i> ;
<i>Praudhamanoramālucamāidī</i>	by Panditarīja Jagannātha the great rhetorician —a criticism of the <i>Prauḍha manoramā</i>

REFERENCES

Belvalkar S K Systems of Sanskrit Grammar
 Keith A B A History of Sanskrit Literature

CHAPTER ELEVEN

POETICS AND DRAMATURGY

A

INTRODUCTION

The literature on poetics and dramaturgy is conspicuously rich in Classical Sanskrit. Many able thinkers have written important works both on poetics and dramaturgy, and it is also a fact that one and the same author has written on both these subjects of kindred nature. Bharata's *Nātyasāstra* is the earliest known treatise on poetics and dramaturgy. The date of this monumental composition has been variously assigned by scholars to the period between the second century B.C. and third century A.D. The *Nātyasāstra* shows unmistakable proofs of a systematic tradition which has preceded it by at least a century. Bharata has been held in high esteem by all later writers on poetics and his work has continued to be a source of inspiration to them.

With the progress of years there arose four main schools of poetics which maintain different views with regard to the essential characteristics of poetry. Thus from time

to time, *Alankāra* (Figure), *Ritī* (Style), *Rūpa* (Aesthetic pleasure) and *Dhvani* (Suggestion) have been declared to be the essential factors of poetry. The *Dhvani* school, however, has grown to be the most important of all other schools of *Alankara* literature. Anandavaidhava the author of the *Dhvanīyalola* is known to be the pioneer of this school and it has been for his commentator Abhinavagupta to bring out the importance of the doctrine of *Dhvani* through his lasting contributions.¹

Bhāmaha is one of the earliest rhetoricians to take up a systematic discussion of poetic embellishments after Bhūratī's treatment of figures. Bhāmaha flourished in all probability in the seventh century AD. His only work the *Kavyalalanī* contains six chapters. In his definition of poetry Bhāmaha has accorded equal status to 'word and import', though he has devoted more attention to the former.

Udbhūta wrote his *Alankarasamgraha* in

(1) *Alankāra* school

Bhāmaha
Kāvyaśāla
kāra

¹ According to modern scholars a comparatively late work on Indian poetics is the *Agnipurāṇa* where in as many as eleven chapters a comprehensive and authoritative information about the various schools of poetics known to the author is available.

the latter half of the eighth century A.D. The work is a collection of verses defining *forty-one* figures and contains *six* chapters. In his treatment of figures Udbhata has followed in the line of Bhāmaha.¹

Rudrāṭa wrote his *Kāvyālankāra* in the first quarter of the ninth century A.D. The work which is in *sixteen* chapters, deals mainly with figures of poetry. In his treatment of figures Rudrāṭa seems to have been the follower of a tradition different from that of Bhāmaha and Udbhata. Of the three commentators of Rudrāṭa, *Namisādhu* appears to be the most important.

Dāṇḍīn, the author of the *Kāvyādarśa*, is the precursor to the Rīti school which was developed by Vāmana. Though Dāṇḍīn is usually assigned to the seventh century A.D., still the mutual priority of Bhāmaha and Dāṇḍīn is a disputed point in the history of Sanskrit poetics. Dāṇḍīn appears to have been greatly influenced by the Alankāra school. His most outstanding con-

¹ Though Udbhata belongs to the Alankāra school, his well-known commentator Pītihārendrīāja, a pupil of Mukulabhatta, is a follower of the Rasa school. Pītihārendrīāja is assigned to the first half of the tenth century A.D.

tribution to poetics is the concept of *Guna*. In his definition of poetry Dandin gives more importance to the word element than to the sense element. The most authoritative commentator of the *Kavyadarśa* is Tarunavācaspati.

Vamana who flourished in the latter half of the eighth century A.D., wrote his *Kavya* *lalitāśasutra* in five chapters and twelve sections in which he boldly asserted that *Riti* is the soul of poetry. The ten *Gunas* are important in so far as they constitute *Riti*. The *Kamadhenu*, a late work by Gopendra Tippa Bhūpāla, is a lucid commentary on the *Kavyalankarasutra*.

Vamana
Kāvya
lalitāśasutra

The *Rasa* school originated from the interpretations by different commentators of Bharata's aphorism on *Rasa*. Lollata who is known to be the earliest interpreter, flourished in the eighth century A.D. The work of Lollata is unfortunately lost to us, though a review of his opinion is found in the *Abhinavabharati* of Abhinavagupta and the *Kavyapriakasa* of Mammata.

(ii) Rasa
school

Lollata

Another interpreter is Sri Śankuka who has criticized the views of Lollata. The work of Sri Śankuka also is lost to us. He is believed to be a junior contemporary of Lollata.

Sri Śankuka

Bhāttaṇāyaka is the most celebrated commentator of the Rasa school. He is said to have flourished between the last quarter of the ninth century A.D. and the beginning of the tenth century A.D. His work, the *Hṛdayadarpana*, is unfortunately lost to us. Bhāttaṇāyaka has rejected the views of Lollata and Śrī-Śāṅkuka. It is interesting to note that Bhāttaṇāyaka has recognized two additional powers of word, viz., the power of generalization (*bhāvahatva*) by which the meaning is made intelligible to the audience and the power of *bhōjakatva* which enables the audience to relish the enjoyment of the poem.

The doctrine of *Dhvani* according to which 'suggestion' is held to be the essence of poetry, was formulated by Ānanda-vāidhana in his *Dhvanyāloka* in the middle of the ninth century A.D. Ānanda-vāidhana informs us that the doctrine of *Dhvani* is very old, the dim beginnings of which are lost in oblivion. According to Ānanda-vāidhana, word is not only endowed with the two powers of denotation (*sākti*) and implication (*lakṣanā*) but also of suggestion (*vyañjanā*). Through the power of sugges-

tion, either a subject, or a figure or a sentiment is revealed

The views of Ānandavudhīnī found a large and definite shape in the writings of his erudite commentator Abhinavagupta who flourished at the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century A.D. Abhinavagupta has to his credit two important commentaries on poetics which may be looked upon as independent treatises and these are the *Locana* on the *Dhanyulola* of Ānandavudhīnī and the *Abhinavabharati* on the *Natyasastra* of Bharata. Abhinavagupta thinks that all suggestion must be of sentiment for the suggestion of subject or that of figure may be ultimately reduced to the *suggestion of sentiment*

Abhinava
gupta
Locana &
Abhinava
bhāratī

B

WORKS ON POETICS & DRAMATURGY

Abhidhāvṛttimātrka by Mukulabhaṭṭa who is generally assigned to the period between the end of the ninth and the beginning of the tenth century A.D.—a grammatico rhetorical work

Kāvyaśāmīmāmsā by Rājasekhara of the tenth century A.D.—written in eighteen

chapters—a practical hand-book for poets

Vakiroktijivita by Kuntala or Kuntaka who flourished in the middle of the tenth century A.D. and belonged to a reactionary school to Dhvani upholding Vakirokti (figurative speech) as the essence of poetry (The Vakirokti school is an off-shoot of the older Alankāra school)

Daśarūpaka by Dhanañjaya of the tenth century A.D.—containing also a section on dramaturgy besides sections on Rasa and allied topics—commented on by Dhanika, a contemporary of Dhanañjaya in his *Avaloka*

Aucityavicāra and *Kaikkunthābharaṇa* } by Ksemendra of the eleventh century A.D.—the first, discussing propriety as essential to sentiment and the second, discussing such topics as the possibility of becoming a poet, the issue of borrowing, etc., etc.

Sarasvatīkanthābharaṇa and *Śringāraprakāśa* } by Bhoja of the first half of the eleventh century A.D.—the first, an encyclopaedic work containing information about different schools of poetics and the second, a supplement to the first and containing a section on dramaturgy

Vyaktiviveka by Mahimabhatta of the second half of the eleventh century A.D. who belonged to the reactionary school

to Dhvani—containing discussions on the possibility of including Dhvani under inference

Maryaprikarā by Mammata of the eleventh century AD—highly influenced by the writings of Anandavardhana and Abhinava Gupta—discusses Rasa as the soul of poetry—commented on by Pācaka (identified with Ruyyaka author of the *Uttarārākṣa*) Majikyacandra, Śīdhara Cāṇḍīlā, Viśvanātha and Govinda besides a number of minor commentators.

Bharataprikarā by Śrīdātānaya who flourished in the first half of the twelfth century AD and was one of the later writers on Rasa—highly influenced by the works of Bhoja—dealing with topics of drama

Alankaraprikarā by Ruyyaka of the latter half of the twelfth century AD—written in the line of Udbhaṭṭa—discussing the importance of Dhvani in so far as it embellishes the expressed meaning—commented on by Jayāratha Vidyākṛiṇavartī and others

Katyānayitana by Hemacandra belonging to the twelfth century AD who has borrowed from the writings of Abhinavagupta, Mammata, Kunṭala and others

<i>Vāgbhālālankāra</i>	by Vāgbhata of the twelfth century A D — a work in verses
<i>Candruloka</i>	by Jayadeva who was not earlier than the twelfth century A D a convenient manual of figures of speech with happy illustrations
<i>Rasamañjari</i> & <i>Rasataraṅgini</i>	by Bhānudatta who was not earlier than the twelfth century A D the two works treating of Rasa and allied topics
<i>Nātyadarpana</i>	by Rāmacandīa and Gunacandīa of the twelfth century A D — a work on dramaturgy differing widely from the <i>Nātyaśāstra</i> of Bharata
<i>Kāvyānuśāsana</i>	by Vāgbhata of the thirteenth century A D who has followed Hemacandīa
<i>Kavītāhāsyā</i> or <i>Kāvyakalpalatā</i>	by Narasimha and his pupil Amā- candīa, two Śvetāmbara Jaina, belonging to the thirteenth cen- tury A D
<i>Kavīkalpalatā</i>	by Devesvara, a Jaina writer, pro- bably belonging to the thirteenth century A D
<i>Nātakalakṣaṇaratnakośa</i>	by Sāgaranandīn of the thirteenth century A D — a work on dramaturgy — strictly following the <i>Nātyaśāstra</i>
<i>Ekāvalī</i>	by Vidyādhara of the fourteenth century A D — written for King Narasimha of Orissa — belonging to the Dhvani school commented on by Malli- nātha in his <i>Tantralā</i>

Pratiparudraya obhū ana by Vidyāñītha of the fourteenth century AD—written for king Pratiprudri of Warangal—a voluminous treatise containing various informations about poetics and dramaturgy

Sāhityadarpana by Viśvanātha of the fourteenth century AD—treating in the manner of Mammata Rasa as the soul of poetry though fully acknowledging the importance of Dhvani—containing discussions on both poetics and dramaturgy—criticizing Mammata and in turn criticized by Govinda and Jagannātha

Ujjvalalalāmanī by Rūpagosvīmin of the sixteenth century AD who regards the Erotic as only a different name of the Devotional (*Bhakti*)—commented on by Jīvagosvīmin who flourished after him in the same century, in his *Locanarocana*

AlankaraSekhara by Ke avamīrī of the sixteenth century AD—a short treatise on poetics the Kīrikīs of which according to the author are the composition of Gauddhodani

Citramimānsā and *Kuralayānanda* } by Appayyādīkṣita of the seventeenth century AD who is noted for his critical insight and originality of appreciation the first has been criticized by Jagannātha and the second is based on the *Candrālola* of Jayadova

Rasagangūdha by Jagannātha of the seventeenth century A D who is the last of the Titans in Indian poetics and evinces a superb power of criticism and presentation an important work on the dialectics of Indian poetics in particular

REFERENCES

De, S K Sanskrit Poetics, Vols I & II
Kane, P V Sāhityadarpana (Introduction)
Keith, A B A History of Sanskrit Literature

CHAPTER TWELVE

METRICS

A

INTRODUCTION

In the Brāhmaṇas we find discussions on metrical matters and it may be presumed that at that time the study of metrics was deemed essential as one of six *Vedāṅgas*

Metrics
a *Vedāṅga*

Pāngala
his *Sūtra*

Pāngala is however, the earliest known author on prosody. In his work which is of the *Sūtra* type we find for the first time the use of algebraic symbols. The book discusses both Vedic and Classical metres. Scholars opine that Pāngala's work is surely earlier than the chapters on metre (chs XIV, XV) in the *Nātyaśāstra* and the metrical section of the *Agnipurāṇa*. The text attributed to this author on Prākṛit metres (*Praulīta Pāngala*) is undoubtedly a later work.

B

WORKS ON METRICS

Śrutabodha ascribed to Kīlāśa and often attributed to Vararuci—a manual of Classical metres

Suvi ttatilaka by Kṣemendīa of the eleventh century
 A.D.—containing a variety of
 Classical metres

Chando'nuśāsana by Hemacandīa of the twelfth
 century A.D.—a compilation and
 not an original work

Vṛttaratnākara by Kedārabhatta (earlier than the
 fifteenth century A.D.)—a bulky
 book dealing with *one hundred and
 thirty-six* metres

Vṛttaratnākara by Nārāyaṇa of the sixteenth century
 A.D.

Chandomañjari by Gangādāsa—a late and yet popular
 work on prosody

REFERENCES

Keith, A. B. A History of Sanskrit Literature

Macdonell, A. A. A History of Sanskrit Literature

Weber, A. The History of Indian Literature

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

LEXICOGRAPHY

A

INTRODUCTION

Yaska's *Nirukta* is the oldest extant lexicographic work which contains a collection of Vedic terms. The lexicons of Classical Sanskrit literature are in many respects different from the *Nirukta*. One of the salient points of difference is that the Classical dictionaries treat of nouns and indeclinables while the *Niruktas* contain both nominal and verbal forms. Almost all the lexicographical works of Classical Sanskrit are written in verse.

The *Namalinganuvasana* or the *Amara Kosa* is one of the earliest lexicographical works in Classical Sanskrit. Amarashinha, the author, probably flourished in the seventh century A.D. He is however believed to have been one of the nine gems in the court of the famous Vikramaditya. Of the many commentators of this work, Kshirasva min, Sarvananda, Bhanupi and Mahesvara are well known.

Yaska
Nirukta

Amara
simha
Amarakosa

B

LESS IMPORTANT LEXICONS

<i>Trīkūnlāsēsa</i> &	} by Purusottama—both early lexicons, containing a collection of many rare words
<i>Hāṇūvalī</i>	
<i>Anekūrthasamuccaya</i>	by Śāśvata a contemporary of Amarasimha
<i>Abhidhūnaratnamūlā</i>	by Halāyudha of the tenth century A.D.
<i>Vaijayantī</i>	by Yādava of the eleventh century A.D.
<i>Abhidhūnacintūmani</i>	} by Hemacandra of the twelfth century A.D.—both containing a rich variety of words
& <i>Anekūrthasamgraha</i>	
<i>Viśvapriakūṣa</i>	by Meheśvara of the twelfth century A.D.
<i>Anekūrthasabdakoṣa</i>	by Medinikāra of the fourteenth century A.D.
<i>Vūcaspatya</i>	by Tālānātha Taikavācaspati of the nineteenth century A.D.—an encyclopaedic work of outstanding merit
<i>Śabdakalpadrīma</i>	an encyclopaedic compilation made by a batch of Sanskrit Pandits in the nineteenth century A.D., under the patronage of Rājā Sri Radhakānta Deva

REFERENCES

Keith, A. B. A History of Sanskrit Literature
 Macdonell, A. A. A History of Sanskrit Literature
 Weber, A. The History of Indian Literature

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LAW

A

GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF LEGAL WORKS

Besides the *Srautisūtras* and the *Grhya* *sūtras* there were in ancient times a number of *Dharmasūtras* which may be viewed as rudimentary texts on civil and religious law. Among these *Dharmasūtras* mention must be made of the *Dharmasūtras* of Gautama, Harita, Vasistha, Bodhāyana, Āpastamba, Huanyakesin and others. It is not definitely known when these *Sūtras* were composed but it is generally believed that their age would approximately be the fifth or the fourth century B C. Two other *Dharmasūtras*, the *Vaisvāradharmasūtra* and the *Vaihānasadharmanasūtra* were written at a later period, the former being assigned to the third century A D.

Early
Dharma
sūtras

The most outstanding and popular work on Brahmanical laws is the *Manuśāstra* or the *Manusmīti*. Though the author of this work is generally known to be

Manu, still the present text is said to have been the work of Bhrgu. Again, from certain references it becomes evident that the present version of the *Manusmṛti* was narrated by one student of Bhrgu and not by Bhrgu himself even. Dr. Buhler suggests that the *Mānavadharmaśāstra* or the *Manusmṛti* is a recast and versification of one original work of the type of Sūtra works known as the *Mānavasūtraharana*, a subdivision of the Maitrīyaṇīya school which adheres to a redaction of the *Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda*.

It has been argued that the present text of the *Manusmṛti* contains various facts about the supremacy of the Brāhmaṇas over other castes. The presumption, therefore, is that the work was written at a time when the Brāhmaṇas were kings of India and had great power in their hands. History tells us that there were Brāhmaṇa kings in India after the fall of the Sungas. It is known that the Kāṇvas ruled in ancient India for forty-five years in the first century B.C. It is suggested that the present text of the *Manusmṛti* was prepared during the reign of the Kāṇvas.

The *Manusmṛti* is written in lucid

Sanskrit verse which comprises 2684 couplets arranged in twelve chapters. The work has been commented on by numerous scholars including Medhātithi, Govindaraja, Narāyaṇi, Kullūl, Raghavānanda and Nandana

Contents &
commen-
tators

B

IMPORTANT WORKS ON LAW

Nāradasmṛti Presumably a late work which has its individual merits but cannot stand comparison with the work of Manu—usually regarded as the legal supplement to the *Manusmṛti*

Bṛhaspatismṛti A supplementary work to the *Manusmṛti*—belonging to the sixth or the seventh century A D

Taṭṭvālak্ষyasmṛti An important work in the style of the *Manusmṛti*—containing a methodical and highly satisfactory treatment with stamps of individuality—not earlier than the third century A D—commented on by Vijñesvara of the eleventh century A D in his *Mitākṣarā*

Tautātitamatatilaka by Bhavadevabhatta (eleventh century A D)
Samskarapaddhati the famous minister of King
& Prayascittapākharana Harivarman of south Ben-
 gal

Smṛtitikalpataru by Lakṣmidhara minister of Govindacandra of Kanauj (twelfth century A D)

Parāśarasmīti The author of this work is not the same person quoted as an authority by Yājñavalkya—commented on by Mādhaba, of the fourteenth century A D, in his *Parāśaramādhava*

Bṛahmanasavasva by Halāyudha, of the twelfth century A D written for King Laksmanasena of Bengal

Daśakarmapaddhati by Paśupati of the twelfth century A D

Pitidayitā by Anūuddha of the twelfth century A D

Caturvargacintāmani by Hemādri of the thirteenth century A D a voluminous work

Dharmaratna by Jīmūtavāhana of the fourteenth century A D—an important work containing the famous *Dāyabhāgū* which dominates the views of Bengal on inheritance

Dipakalikā by Śūlapāni of the fourteenth century A D—a commentary on the *Yājñavalkyasmīti*

Madanapūriyāta by Viśvesvara of the fourteenth century A D—a work on religious laws

Vivādaatnākara,
Smītiatnākara
 and other
*Ratnākara*s } by Candeśvara, grand-uncle of, Vidyāpati, minister of Hāsimha of the fourteenth century A D—very important law books

Raghunandanasmītis by Raghunandana of the sixteenth century A D—twenty-eight in number—all bearing the appella-

tion of *Tattva* or *Tithitattva*
Udrakshatattva etc—highly authoritative specially in Bengal

<i>Vitradacintamani</i> <i>Vyavaharacintamani</i> and other <i>Cintamani</i> s	} by Vicaspati who wrote for Bhuravasinha (Harinir yana) and Ramabhadra (Rupaniriyana) of Mithili (fifteenth century A.D)— highly important law books
<i>Viramitrodaya</i>	by Mitramitra of the seventeenth century A.D—a voluminous work
<i>Nirnayasindhu</i>	by Kamalikarabhatta of the seven teenth century A.D

REFERENCES

Buhler G SBI Vol XXV
 Kane P V History of Dharmasāstra
 Keith A B A History of Sanskrit Literature
 Weber A The History of Indian Literature

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

POLITICS

A

INTRODUCTION

Of the four objects of life the science of politics deals with the aim and achievement of the second (*artha*) and Kautilya's *Arthashastra* amply proves the existence of the study of political science and practical life in ancient India. The *Arthashastra* is an outstanding work in the field of Indian politics and is claimed by some modern scholars to have been composed sometime in the third century A.D., though traditionally the author is believed to have been none other than Cānakya or Viṣṇugupta, the able minister of Maurya Candragupta (fourth century B.C.), who has been unanimously recognized by all scholars as the Machiavelli of India. The *Arthashastra*, however, mentions *Brhaspati*, *Bāhudantiputra*, *Viśālākṣa* and *Uśanas* as authorities. The book is a perfect manual for the conduct of kings in their political existence. Later works on this science are mainly based on the *Arthashastra*.

B

MINOR WORKS ON POLITICS

Nitisāra by Kīmandaka—written in verse with the character of a Kīvya—not later than the eighth century A.D

Nitruākyamrta by Somadeva the author of *Yasas tilaka*—the details of war and kindred topics are meagrely dealt with and the author appears to be a great moral teacher

Laghu Arhanniti by the great Jaina writer Hema candra (1088 A.D.—1172 A.D.)—written in verse—an abbreviation of another bigger work of the author written in Prākrit

Yuktikalpataru ascribed to Bhoja

Nitratnākara by Candesvara a jurist—grand uncle of Vidyāpati

Sukraniti of unknown authorship—a work of a very late date mentioning the use of gunpowder

REFERENCES

Keith A B A History of Sanskrit Literature

Macdonell A A A History of Sanskrit Literature

Weber A The History of Indian Literature

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

EROTICS

A

INTRODUCTION

Erotics or the science of love was specially studied in ancient India. The most outstanding work on the subject is the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana who is placed sometime in the third century A.D. The work is divided into seven parts and is written in prose interspersed with stray verses. The work does not claim to have been the first to be written on that subject. The work is a mine of informations on matters relating to the social order and customs of the day.

Yaśodhaia of the thirteenth century A.D. wrote a commentary, the *Jayamangalā*, on the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana. Credit is due to this commentator who has explained many technical terms used by Vātsyāyana.

Vātsyāyana:
Kāmasūtra

Yaśodhara
Jaya-
mangalā

B

MINOR WORKS ON EROTICS

Pañcasūyaka by Jyotnīśvara—later than Kṣemendra
Ratnāhasya by Kokkoka—prior to 1200 A.D.

Ratimañjari by one Jayadeva of unknown date—
sometimes identified with the
poet of the *Gitagovinda*

Anangaranga by Kalyānamalla of the sixteenth
century A.D.

Ratisāstra by Nīgārjuna of unknown date—often
wrongly identified with the great
Buddhist thinker

REFERENCE

Keith A. B. A History of Sanskrit Literature

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

MEDICINE

A

HISTORY OF MEDICAL WORKS

A study of Vedic literature will reveal that Anatomy, Embriology and Hygiene were known to Vedic Indians. The science of Āyurveda was also looked upon as one of the auxiliary sciences to the Vedas. There are references in early literature to ancient sages who delivered instruction on the science of medicine. Ātreyā is one of these sages who is usually held to be the founder of the science while Cāṇakya is said to have written on medicine. According to Buddhist tradition, Jīvaka, a student of Ātreyā, was a specialist in the diseases of children.

Introduc-
tion

Caraka

The earliest extant literature on medicine is the *Carakasamhitā*. Caraka, according to Professor Lévi, was a contemporary of King Kaniska. It is, however, known that the present text of Caraka was revised by one Drdhabala, a Kāshmīrian, who lived as late as the eighth or the ninth century A.D.

Suśruta is another great teacher of Indian medicine whose name occurs in the famous

Bower Manuscript and who is mentioned as the son of Visvamitra in the *Mahabharata*. As early as the ninth and the tenth centuries his reputation travelled far beyond India. Among his commentators mention must be made of Cakrapānidatta (eleventh century A.D.), besides Jaiyyata, Gayadāsa and Dallana.

Bhela is another authority who is said to have written a *Samhita* which, in the opinion of some scholars is earlier than the work of Cūlakī.

Susruta &
his com-
mentators

Bhela

B

LATER MEDICAL WORKS

<i>Aslungasamgraha</i> and <i>Aslungahṛdayasamhitā</i>	by Viḍbhata the next great authority after Susruta—often identified with the medical authority referred to by I tsing
<i>Rasaratnākara</i>	by Nāgārjuna probably of the seventh or the eighth century A.D. —containing a section on the practical application of mercury
<i>Vidana</i>	by Mīdhavakara of the eighth or the ninth century A.D.—an important treatise on Pathology
<i>Cikitsasarasamgraha</i>	by Cakrapānidatta a work on Therapeutics

Cikitsākālikā by Tisata of the fourteenth century
A D

Bhāvapratikāṣṭa by Bhāvamīśa of the sixteenth
century A D

Vaidyayāṇīṇī by Lolimbarāja of the seventeenth
century A D

REFERENCES

Keith, A B A History of Sanskrit Literature

Macdonell, A A A History of Sanskrit Literature.

Weber, A The History of Indian Literature

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

ASTRONOMY, MATHEMATICS AND ASTROLOGY

A

HISTORY OF ASTRONOMY

It is not definitely known whether Astronomy was systematically studied as a science in Vedic times. It is as late as the sixth century A.D. when in the *Pañca siddhāntikā* of *Vāsiṣṭhamīśvara* we get the information about the contents of five Siddhāntas of an earlier date. It is, however a fact that the lunar mansions were known to Vedic Indians. Dr. Weber says that the names of some asterisms occur in the *Rgveda*, the *Satapatha-brāhmaṇa*, the *Taittirīya-saṁhitā* and the *Atharva-vēda*. It is presumed that with the discovery of planets the science of Astronomy made a significant advance. Planets are mentioned in the *Taittirīya-āraṇyaka*, the two Great Epics, and the Law books of Manu. It still remains an open question however whether the ancient Indians discovered the planets independently of others or whether

Astronomy
an early
science

the knowledge came to them from a foreign source. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that Indian Astronomy thrived well under Greek influence.

B

WORKS ON ASTRONOMY

**Āryabhata
his works**

Before the discovery of the *Pañcasiddhāntikā*, Āryabhata was regarded as the only authority on Indian Astronomy. Āryabhata wrote towards the close of the fifth century A.D. Three of his works now available to us are the *Āryabhatīya*, in ten stanzas, the *Daśagītikāsūtra* and the *Āryāstasāta* in which there is a section on Mathematics.

**Āryabhata
Ārya-
siddhānta**

Āryabhata is to be carefully distinguished from another author of the same name who wrote the *Āryasiddhānta* in the tenth century A.D. and was known to Albērūnī.

**Brahma-
gupta
his
works**

Brahmagupta is another great name in Indian Astronomy who in the seventh century A.D. wrote two important works, the *Brahmasphutasiddhānta* and the *Khandakhādyaka*.

Lalla who is later than Brahmagupta, has to his credit one work the *Si yadhr̄ ddhitantra*

Lalla
Si yadhr̄ ddhitantra

To the eleventh century belong two writers Bhoja and Sitananda whose works are respectively the *Rajamrganika* and the *Bhascari*

Bhoja &
Sitananda
their works

Bhāskaracārya of 1150 AD wrote his masterpiece the *Siddhāntasīromani* which is divided into four sections A second work of his is the *Karanāluttuhala*

Bhāskara
his works

C

WORKS ON MATHEMATICS

In the field of Indian Mathematics there are only a few names Aryabhata was the first to include in his work a section on Mathematics Brahmagupta has discussed the principles of ordinary Arithmetic in a brief manner In the ninth century AD Mahāvīracārya wrote an elementary but comprehensive work on Indian Mathematics In the tenth century AD he wrote his *Tantras* which discusses quadratic equations It was Bhāskaracārya who in the two sections viz., *Lilāvati* and *Bijagamita* of his work the *Siddhāntasīromani* made

Aryabhata
Brahma
gupta
Mahāvīra &
Bhāskara

some lasting contributions to Indian Mathematics

D

WORKS ON ASTROLOGY

Early
works

In India Astrology has been studied as a science from very ancient times. The works of Varāhamihira, of course, eclipsed the fame of earlier authorities whose writings are now lost to us. Fragments of one *Vrddhayaoga-samhitā* are still available. Varāhamihira classified Astrology into the *three* branches of *Tantra* the astronomical and mathematical foundations, *Hora* that dealing with horoscope and *Samhitā* that discussing natural Astrology. The most outstanding contribution of Varāhamihira is the *Brhatsamhitā* which was commented on by Bhattotpala. On the *Hora* section Varāhamihira wrote two works, the *Bṛhajjātaka* and the *Laghujātaka*. Besides the works of Varāhamihira, we find a reference to one *Yavanajātaka* of dubious authorship.

Later works

Among later works on Astrology, mention may be made of the *Horaśatapañcāśulā* by Prthuyaśas, son of Varāhamihira, the *Horaśāstra* by Bhattotpala, the *Vidyā-*

madhaviya (before 1350 A.D.) the *Vṛddha vaśiśhasamhita* of unknown authorship, the *Jyotrasāroddhara* of Harsikirti, the *Jyotividyabharana* of unknown authorship (not later than the sixteenth century A.D.) and the *Tajika* in two parts (the *Samyña tantra* and the *Varṣatantra*) of Nilakantha (sixteenth century A.D.)¹

REFERENCES

Keith A. B. A History of Sanskrit Literature
 Macdonell A. A. A History of Sanskrit Literature
 Weber A. The History of Indian Literature

¹ Closely associated with works on Astrology are treatises on omens and prognostications. Among such treatises are the *Idbhutasagara* (twelfth century A.D.) and the *Samudratilaka* (twelfth century A.D.) by Durlabharāja and Jagaddeva. The *Ramalarahasya* of Bhayabhañjanasarman is a work on geomancy and under the style of the *Puṣakakevali* preserved in the Bower Manuscript are the two treatises on cubomancy.

CHAPTER NINETEEN

MISCELLANEOUS SCIENCES

Archery

It is a pity that though the Indians specialized in almost every branch of Sanskrit literature, the literature on quite a good number of minor sciences is little known to us. Thus there are no extant works on Archery. Among the authoritative writers on Archery the names of Vikramāditya, Sadāśiva and Śālangadatta have reached us.

Sciences of elephants & horses

On the sciences of elephants and horses which are associated with the names of two ancient sages Pālakāpya and Śālihotra respectively, a few works are available. The *Hastyāyurveda* of uncertain date and the *Mātangalilā* of Nārāyana are the two known works on the science of elephants. The *Asvāyurveda* of Gana, the *Asiavaidyaka* of Jayadatta and of Dipankara, the *Yogamāñjari* of Vaidhaināna and the *Asracikitsā* of Nakula are extant works on the science of horses.

Architecture

The literature on Architecture is represented by the *Vāstuvidyā*, the *Manusyālayacandrikā* in seven chapters, the *Mayamāta*

in thirty four chapters, the *Yuktikalpataru* in twenty three chapters, the *Samarangana sutradhara* of Bhoja, the *Viralarma prakasa* and some sections of the *Brhatsamhita*, the *Matsyapurana*, the *Agnipurana* the *Garudapurana*, the *Vinudhamottara*, the *Kasyapasamhita*, the *Silparatna* of Srikuṇā and such other works

The science of jewels has been discussed in such works as the *Agastimata*, the *Ratnapariksa* of Buddhabhatta and the *Navaratnapariksa* of Narāyanapandita

Science of Jewels

Mention may be made of the *Sanmukha Lalpa*, a treatise on the science of stealing

Science of Stealing

Mention should also be made of the *Nalapaka* which treats of the art of cooking

Science of Cooking

On music there have been many important works besides the *Natyāstṛta*. Among the more important works on this subject, mention may be made of the *Sangitamahāvāndā*, the *Sangitasudarśana* of Sudarśan, the *Sangitaratnakara* of Sarangideva, the *Sangitadarpana* of Dāmodara and the *Ragārbodha* of Somanātha

Science of Music

On dancing the literature is not very extensive. Besides the *Natyāstṛta*, we have the *Abhinayadarpana* of Nandikesvara,

Science of Dancing

the *Srihastamuktāvalī*, the *Nartanānūnaya*
and a few other works

On painting the *Vismudharīmottara*, of
uncertain date, contains a chapter

REFERENCES

Keith, A. B. A History of Sanskrit Literature
Weber, A. The History of Indian Literature

CHAPTER TWENTY PHILOSOPHY

A

ORTHODOX SYSTEMS

The Nyāya system which represents the analytic type of philosophy like the Vaisesika system has a long history that extends over the vast period of twenty centuries. Indian tradition has assigned a unique status to this system and it has been universally held in high esteem and reverence.

*Nyāya
Introduction*

*Works on
Nyāya
(a) Old
school*

There are two well known schools of the Nyāya system and they are the old and the new. The earliest known literature of the old school are the *Nyayasutras* of Gautama which are divided into five books. It is believed that the *Nyayasutras* are as old as the third century B.C.¹ Vaisesayana

¹ Dr. S. C. Vidyabhusan believes that Gautama wrote only the first chapter of the work and was a contemporary of Buddha. He further thinks that this Gautama is the same as the author of the *Dharma-sūtras* who lived in Mithili in the sixth century B.C. He suggests that Gautama's original views are contained in the *Carakasamhita* (*Vimanasthana*). But the *Carakasamhita* itself has suffered considerable re-

Nyāyabhāṣya is the most important commentary on the *Nyāyasūtras* of Gautama and it is presumed that the work was written before 400 A.D. Vātsyāyana's views were vehemently criticized by Dignāga, the famous Buddhist logician, whose probable date is not later than the fifth century A.D. Uddyotakara wrote his *Nyāyavārttika* in the sixth century A.D. with the sole object of defending Vātsyāyana against the criticisms of Dignāga. It was Dharmakīrti, another noted Buddhist logician, who took up the cause of Dignāga and wrote his *Nyāyabindu* in the latter part of the sixth century A.D. Probably Uddyotakara and Dharmakīrti were contemporaries

fashioning and its date is uncertain. Professor Jacobi believes that the *Nyāyasūtras* and the *Nyāyabhāṣya* belong to about the same time perhaps separated by a generation. He places them between the second century A.D. when the doctrine of Śūnya developed, and the fifth century A.D. when the doctrine of Vijnāna was systematized. Professor Surali also supports Professor Jacobi and refers the work to 300 A.D. According to Professor Gaibé the date is 100 A.D. MM Haraprasāda Śāstrikā believes that the work has undergone several redactions. Professor Radhakrishnan places it (though not in the present form) in the fourth century B.C.

who mutually referred to each other. A commentary on the *Nyayabindu* was written in the ninth century by the Buddhist logician Dharmottari. It was in the first half of the ninth century A.D. that Vācaspati, a versatile genius and most prolific writer, came to write his *Nyayaśāntikatātparyātika*, a super commentary on the *Nyayaśāntikā* of Uddyotakarṇi and gave a sufficient stimulus to the orthodox line of thought by writing his *Nyayasūcībandha* (841 A.D.) and *Nyayasutroddhara*. Udayana who is noted for his trenchant logic and convincing presentation of facts, wrote a commentary on Vācaspati's *Nyayaśāntikatātparyātika*, known as the *Nyayaśāntikatātparyātikāśuddhi* in the first part of the tenth century (984 A.D.). The *Nyayakusumāñjali*, the *Ātmatattvaviveka*, the *Kvānakāli* and the *Nyayaśāntikā* are four other well known works of Udayana. Jayanta is the next great name after Udayana and he wrote the *Nyayamañjari* in the tenth century A.D. He is admitted to have been a Bengali by origin. Bhāsaivajñāna's *Nyayasara* is a survey of Indian logic. The author was a Kashmiri Suvite of the tenth century A.D.

Gangeshvara is the father of the new school

of the Nyāya system (Navyanyāya) which flourished mainly in Bengal. His *Tattvacintāmani* is a *magnum opus* which was written in the last quarter of the twelfth century A.D. The work discusses primarily the *four* means of knowledge admitted in the Nyāya system. His son Vaidharmāna (1225 A.D.) continued the tradition by writing commentaries on the treatises of Udayana and Gangeśa Jayadeva (sometimes identified with Pakṣadharma Miśra) of Mithilā wrote his *Āloka* on the *Tattvacintāmani* in the latter part of the thirteenth century A.D. Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma, a Bengali Brāhmaṇa, wrote his *Tattvacintāmanvyākhyā* the first great work of the Navadvipa (Nadia) school. He had at least three distinguished pupils Śrī-Caitanya Mahāprabhu, the famous Vaiṣṇava saint and founder of the Gaudiya Vaiṣṇava school, Raghunātha Śiromani, the great logician and Kṛṣṇananda Āgama-vāgiśa, the author of the *Tantrasāra*. Raghunātha wrote two outstanding works, viz., the *Dīdhīti* and the *Padārthaḥkhandana* in the fifteenth century A.D. Jagadīśa (end of the sixteenth century A.D.) and Gadādhara (seventeenth century A.D.) are reputed

thinkers of the modern school, who wrote beside many commentaries, the *Sabdasañcita* and the *Lyaptipancala* respectively. Visvāmatha's *Nyayasutriargita* (1631 A.D.) is another important work.

The logicians of the old school recognize sixteen categories while those of the modern school who have been greatly influenced by the Vaisesika system reduce them to seven only. The logicians of both schools accept four means of proof viz. perception (*pratyaksha*) inference (*anumana*) analogy (*upamana*) and verbal testimony (*abda*). They do not admit of the self manifestation of a cognition. Like the Vaisesika the Nyāya regards the world as a composite of external unchanging and causeless atoms. The soul in the Nyāya system is a 'real substantive being' which has certain qualities. The God (Iśvara) is the Supreme Spirit or the Universal Soul who acts as the Creator of the universe in the capacity of inefficient cause (*nimittalakṣana*) while the atoms are the material cause (*upadanalakṣana*). A true knowledge (*tattvajñana*) of the categories leads to the liberation (*mukti*) of the soul in bondage and the liberated soul is essentially conscious.

Funda-
mental
concepts
of Nyāya

II
Vaisesika
Introduc-
tion

The Vaiśeṣika system which is also called the Aulukya philosophy, is closely akin to the Nyāya system. It is, however, presumed that the earliest extant literature of this system is older than what is available in the Nyāya system. Thus while the *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* of Kanāda (Kanabhakṣa, Kanabhuk or Kāśvapa) and the *Padārtha-dharmasamgraha* of Piśastapāda, evince no influence of the Nyāya system, the *Nyāyasūtras* of Gautama and the *Bhāṣya* of Vātsyāyana betray the fact that they have been greatly influenced by the views of the Vaiśeṣika system.

Works on
Vaisesika

The *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* of Kanāda which are of unknown date but are generally assigned to a date which is later than 300 B.C., received additions from time to time. They are divided into ten books. The work of Piśastapāda which is generally regarded as a commentary on the *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* may be viewed as an original contribution to the Vaiśeṣika system. Piśastapāda is usually assigned to the end of the fourth century A.D., though Dr. Keith makes him later than Dignāga, but earlier than Uddyotakāra. There are four noted commentaries on the work of Piśastapāda and they are

(1) the *Vyomavati* by Vyomisivācārya who is Vyomisekhara or Sivāditya (of unknown date, probably of the ninth century A.D.) (2) the *Nyaya Landali* by Sudhara (first part of the tenth century A.D.), (3) the *Kiranavali* and the *Lalavali* by Udayīya (first part of the tenth century A.D.) and (4) the *Nyaya Lalavati* by Srivatsa or Vallabhā (probably towards the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century A.D.) Sankara's *Upaskara* (latter half of the fifteenth century A.D.) is one important commentary on the *Vaisesikasutras* of Kāṇāda. Langāksa Bhāskara's *Tarjalaumudi* is another work based on *Priyatīpāda's* treatise.

Among manuals belonging to both Nyāya and Vaisesika systems of Indian philosophy, may be mentioned Sivāditya's *Saptapadarthī* (eleventh century A.D.) Vānduva's *Tarjalaśāla* Kesivamisra's *Tarjalabhāṣa* (thirteenth or fourteenth century A.D.) Annambhatta's *Tarjalaśamgraha* and *Dipīla* (sixteenth or seventeenth century A.D.), Jagadisvara's *Tarjalaśāla* (1685 A.D.) and Viswanātha's *Bhasapariccheda* or *Kārikavali* (seventeenth century A.D.) and its famous commentary *Siddhantamuktavali* by him.

self Jayanārāyaṇa's (seventeenth century A.D.) *Vivṛti* is another important compendium of the Vaiśeṣika school

The Vaiśeṣika system which in broader details agrees with the Nyāya, accepts six categories to which a *seventh* was added later on. It recognizes only *two* means of knowledge, viz., perception and inference. It does not accept verbal testimony as an independent means of proof, but as one included in inference. Both the Vaiśeṣika and the Naiyāyika are advocates of what is known in philosophical terms as *Asatkāiyavāda* (the doctrine of the creation of the non-existent effect) and *Āṇambhavāda* (the doctrine of initiation which makes the universe an effect newly produced from the eternal atoms). In the state of liberation, the soul in Vaiśeṣika conception retains no consciousness (*jñāna*), while in the Nyāya view the released soul is conscious.

The Sāṅkhya system is universally believed to be the oldest of the existing systems of Indian philosophy. The Sāṅkhya views are found in the Upaniṣads, in the *Mahābhārata*, in the Law-books of Manu and in the medical works of Caiaka and others. Indian tradition ascribes the

uthorship of the system to the sage Kripa in the narration of Lord Visnu. The successors of Kripa were Āśvini Pañcaśikha, Gaṇava and Ulūpa. Professor Grube makes Pañcasikha a contemporary of the great Mimāṃsāst Saburūṣvāmin (sometime between 100 A.D. and 300 A.D.) Chinese tradition ascribes the authorship of the *Saṃhitā* to Pañcasikha while Vṛṣṇiganya gets the same credit in other's opinion.

The *Sanīhyalāṅka* is the earliest known work of the Sāṃkhya system. It is believed that Iṣvārakṛṣṇa wrote this work in the third century A.D.¹ An important commentary on the *Kārikā* is that of Gaudapādā.² The *Māhāvṛtti* is another commentary which is regarded by some to be the source of Gaudapāda's commentary while others

Works on
Sāṃkhya

¹ A Chinese tradition ascribes to Vindhyavīśin the writing of a work of Vṛṣṇiganya. Professor Tikkalusu identifies Vindhyavīśin with Iṣvārakṛṣṇa. In that case the *Kārikā* of Iṣvārakṛṣṇa has an earlier basis. Gunaratna however regards Vindhyavīśin and Iṣvārakṛṣṇa as different. Iṣvārakṛṣṇa was earlier than Vasubandhu who is now assigned to the fourth century A.D. The *Kārikā* was translated into Chinese by Paramīrtha (sixth century A.D.)

² Whether he is the same as the author of the

assign a later date to it. Yet another commentary on the *Sāṅkhyakārikā* is the *Yuktidīpikā* which is wrongly ascribed to Vācaspati. The *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī* of Vācaspati (middle of the ninth century A.D.) is a most popular work of this system. Another popular work is the *Sāṅkhyapravacanasūtra* which contains six chapters. The authorship of this work is attributed to one Kapila. But this Kapila cannot be identical with the founder sage of this system, for the work cannot but be assigned to such a late date as the fourteenth century A.D., since it is not referred to even in the *Saivadarśanasamgraha* of Mādhaba (fourteenth century A.D.). Aniruddha's *Sāṅkhyasūtravṛtti* which was composed in the fifteenth century A.D., is an important work commenting on the *Sāṅkhyapravacanasūtra*. But the *Sāṅkhyapravacanabhāṣya* of Vijñānbhikṣu, (sixteenth century A.D.) a commentary on the *Sāṅkhyapravacanasūtra*, is the most important work of the system. Vijñānbhikṣu wrote another work on Sāṅkhya known as the *Sāṅkhyasāra*.

Māndūḥyakārikā cannot be decided, and some seek to place him in the eighth century A.D.

The Sāṅkhyā system is essentially dualistic, inasmuch as it speaks of Purusa (Spirit) and Prakrti (Matter) as the two Ultimate Realities. The fundamental position of this system is that 'cause is the entity in which 'effect lies in a subtle form. Thus this system advocates the doctrine of Sathkaryavada. The world is said to be the evolution of Prakrti which is its material cause. Prakrti has been described to be of the nature of equilibrium of the triple Gunas *sattva* (purity stuff), *rajas* (passion stuff) and *tamas* (inertia stuff). Purusa is defined as Pure Spirit which is different from Prakrti and Purusas are many in number. A Supreme Spirit (Isvara) or God is not admitted to exist in so many words. The Sāṅkhyā system acknowledges the authority of three means of knowledge viz perception, inference and verbal testimony.

The Yogi and the Sāṅkhyā systems are used as complementary aspects of one whole system. While the Sāṅkhyā system signifies theory, the Yogi signifies 'practice'. In the Upanisads, the *Mahabharata*, the *Jatak* and the Buddhist literatures Yogi practices have been mentioned.

The *Yogasutras* of Patanjali form the

Fundamental concepts of Sāṅkhyā

IV
Yoga

Introduction

earliest extant literature on the Yoga system. The *Yogasūtras* are divided into four chapters known as *Samādhi* (Concentration), *Sādhana* (Practice), *Vibhūti* (Miraculous Powers) and *Kaivalya* (Emancipation). It was Vyāsa who, according to modern scholars, is said to have written a masterly commentary on the *Yogasūtras* about the fourth century A.D., though traditionally he is believed to be the same as the author of the *Mahābhārata*. Vācaspati wrote an interesting and learned gloss on the *Vyāsabhbāṣya* known as the *Tattvavārsāraḍī*. Nāgeśabhatta of the eighteenth century A.D., wrote another gloss on the *Vyāsabhbāṣya* known as the *Chāyā*. Other important works on the Yoga system are the *Rājamārtanda* of Bhoja (eleventh century A.D.) and the *Yogavārttika* and the *Yogasārasaṅgraha* of Vījñānabhīksu (sixteenth century A.D.). Vījñānabhīksu criticizes Vācaspati and

¹ It is traditionally believed that Patañjali, the author of the *Yogasūtras* is the same person as the great grammarian of that name who wrote the *Māhābhāṣya* in the middle of the second century B.C. But there is no positive evidence to prove the identity and some modern scholars are positively against this

brings the Yogi system nearer to the philosophy of the Upansisads

The Yogi system discusses how through methodical effort of concentration of mind we can attain perfection. It teaches us how to control the different elements of human nature both physical and psychical. The Yogi system explains fully the principles according to which 'the physical body, the active will and the understanding mind are to be harmonically brought under control. This is technically known by the name Royal Yogi (Rājyoga). There is yet a magical side of Yogi (Hṛthayoga) which describes how to perform miracles of various nature. Too much indulgence in this Hṛthayoga serves as an obstacle to the attainment of real Perfection.

The Yogi system materially differs from the Sāṅkhya at least in one essential point viz., that while the latter system does not explicitly speak anything of God the former regards God as a third category besides

view Bhoja in the introductory verses of the *Rajamārtanīṣa* makes a suggestion to the effect that Patañjali (author of the *Mahābhāṣya*) Patañjali (author of the *Yogasūtras*) and Caraka (author of the *Carakasamhitu*) are identical.

Rājyoga &
Hṛthayoga

Yoga &
Sāṅkhya
comparison

Prakṛti and Purusa and holds that devotion to the Lord is also one of the means of Release (*Kaivalya*).

The Pūrvamīmāṃsā, Karmamīmāṃsā or the Mīmāṃsā system mainly interprets and explains Vedic injunctions and their applications, and as such it has a unique importance of its own.

The earliest literature on the Pūrvamīmāṃsā are the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtras* of Jaimini who, according to modern scholars, wrote in all probability in the fourth century B.C. The orthodox tradition, however, makes Jaimini a disciple of Vyāsa, the author of the *Mahābhārata*. It is held by some that the *Mīmāṃsāsūtras* are later than both the *Nyāyasūtras* and the *Yoga-sūtras*. Śabara wrote his commentary on the *Mīmāṃsāsūtras* probably in the first century B.C. Professor Jacobi thinks that the *Vṛtti* quoted by Śabara, belongs to a period between 200 A.D. and 500 A.D., while Dr. Keith holds 400 A.D. to be the earliest date for it. Śabara's predecessors were Upavaiṣa, Bodhāyana, Bhāṭṭmitra, Bhavadāsa and Hail MM Sri Ganganath Jha identifies Bhavadāsa with the *Vṛttikāra* referred to in the *Śabarabhāṣya*. Both the *Mīmāṃsā-*

V
Pūrvamī-
māṃsā

Introduction

Works on
Pūrvamī-
māṃsā

sutras and the *Bhasya* were interpreted differently by three different schools of thought associated with the names of Prabhākari, Kumārī and Muārī. The school of Muārī is known by name alone.

Prabhākari who was called Gaudi, munīmāsaka and Guru wrote the *Bṛhatī* a commentary on the *Bhasya* of Śibiṛī, probably about 600 A.D. According to some Prabhākari preceded Kumārī, while the tradition runs that he was a pupil of Kumārī. Sālikumāthī's *Rjulimala* which is a commentary on the *Bṛhatī*, was written about the ninth century A.D. Another important work of the same author is the *Prajātaranapāñcīla*, a good and useful manual of the Prābhākari system. Sāhī within his referred to Dhūmikirtī. Bhāvumāthī's *Naya vñela* (c. 1050 A.D.—1150 A.D.) is another important work of this school. Vācaspatī in his *Nyayalambī* differentiates between two sub schools of the Prābhākariś, viz. old and new.

Kumārī is a great name in Indian philosophy, noted for his spirited zeal for Brāhmaṇical orthodoxy. It was he who fought courageously against the onslaughts of Buddhism, and but for the stand he took up, much of Brāhmaṇical heritage of which

Prabhākari
school

Bhāṭṭa
school

we feel proud today, would have been lost. Kumārla's *Ślokavārttika*, *Tantravārttika* and *Tupṭīkā* are the three great works. The first one, which is in verse, is a commentary on the first part of the first chapter of the *Mīmāṃsāsūtras*. The second which is in prose, occasionally interspersed with verses, takes us to the end of the third chapter, while the third covers the rest. Kumārla is earlier than Śankara and is usually assigned to 750 A.D., though some new data point to the fact that he lived in the seventh century A.D. The *Ślokavārttika* was commented upon by Umbeka or Bhavabhūti (eighth century A.D.), by Sucaritamīśa (not later than the middle of the thirteenth century A.D.) in his *Kāśikā* and by Pārthasārathimīśa (according to the orthodox tradition, tenth century A.D., according to Professor Radhakrishnan, 1300 A.D.) in his *Nyāyavātnākara*. The *Tantravārttika* was commented upon by Bhavadevabhatta (eleventh century A.D.) in his *Tautātītamatatilaka* and by Someśvarabhatta (c. 1200 A.D.) in his *Nyāyasudhā*. Veṅkaṭādikṣita wrote his commentary on the *Tupṭīkā* known as the *Vārttikābharana*. Mandana (eighth century A.D.) is the next great

name after Kumārīla who is reported to be Mandana's teacher and father in law. Mandana who is earlier than Vācaspati and is traditionally identified with Suresvara and Viśvarūpa, wrote his *Vidhviveka*, *Bhavana viveka*, *Vibhramaviveka* and *Mimamsanulōka mani*¹. The first was commented upon by Vācaspati in his *Nyayakarika*.

Among independent works on the Mimamsa system, may be mentioned the *Sastradīpikā* of Pārthīśārathuniśri, the *Jaiminiyanyayamala* of Mādhvī (fourteenth century A.D.), the *Upalaramapāṭṭalāma* and the *Vidhivivekāya* of Appayyādīksitā, the *Mimamsanyayapāṭṭalāma* of Āpodeva (seventeenth century A.D.), the *Arthasamgraha* of Laugaksibhāṣṭa (seventeenth century A.D.) the *Bhaṭṭadīpikā*, the *Mimamsalauṭubha* and the *Bhaṭṭaṭīhāsya* of Kṛṇadadeva (seventeenth century A.D.), the *Bhaṭṭacintāmāni* of Gāgabhatta (seventeenth century A.D.), the *Manameyodaya* of Nārāyanabhatta (seventeenth century A.D.) and the *Mimamsa paribhaṣa* of Kṛṣṇayajvan (eighteenth century A.D.). Ramakṛṣṇabhatta, author of the *Yulīti*

Independent
works on
Mimamsa

¹ The *Sphoṭasiddhi* of Mandana which explains the grammarian's doctrine of Sphoṭa is an important work.

snehaprapūrani, Somanātha, author of the *Mayūkhamālikā*, Dīnakarabhātta and Kāmalākarabhātta belong to the Bhātta school.

Important
concepts of
Mimāṃsā

The Pūrvamīmāṃsā system recognizes the self-validity of knowledge. Jaimini accepts only *three* means of knowledge - perception, inference and verbal testimony. To these *three* Piṭabhākara adds *two* more, viz., comparison (*upamāna*) and implication (*arthāpatti*). Kumārila also recognizes non-apprehension (*anupalabdhī*) as a means of knowledge. It is generally believed that the Pūrvamīmāṃsā has not accorded any significant status to God, though, in the *Vedāntasūtras*, Jaimini has been represented as theistic in his views.¹

VI
Vedānta
Introduc-
tion

The Uttaramīmāṃsā, Brahmanīmāṃsā or the Vedānta is the most popular of all orthodox systems of Indian philosophy. The earliest teachers of the school were Āśmarathya, Bādarī, Kārṣṇājīni, Kāśakṛtsna, Audulomi and Ātreyā. These teachers along with Jaimini are mentioned in the *Vedāntasūtras*.

Scholars differ with regard to the age when the *Vedāntasūtras* or the *Brahmasūtras*

¹ Introduction to the Pūrvamīmāṃsā, Dr. Pashupatinath Shastri, pp 132-8

of Bādarāyaṇa were composed. Modern Indian scholars are inclined to assign as early a date as the sixth century B.C., while others would prefer to fix the date between 100 B.C. and 200 A.D.¹

The *Vedantasutras* contain four chapters. The first discusses the Brahman as the Ultimate Reality. The second deals with objections raised by rival schools of philosophy. The third proposes to study the means of attaining Brahmanavidyā, while the fourth discusses the results of Brahmanavidyā. The *Vedantasutras* are in intimate agreement with the teachings of the Upanisads. As such Bādarāyaṇa has evinced his great and abiding reverence for the Vedas. Unlike the Sāṅkhyas, the Vedānta

The
Vedānta
sutras

¹ The orthodox Indian tradition makes the author identical with Vyīsa, the author of the *Mahābhārata*. Sāṅkarācārya however does not clearly state anywhere that Vyīsa (or Kṛṣṇadvīpiyana born as an incarnation of the Vedic sage Apīntaratamaṇi by the direction of Lord Viṣṇu) was the author of the *Brahmasūtras*. He calls this author invariably as Bīdarīyana and never as Vyīsa and does not explicitly say that the two are identical. But Viścaspati Ḫāndagiri Rīmīnuja Madhvā Vallabha and Bala deva identify Bīdarīyana with Vyīsa.

of Bādarāyana champions the cause of monism when he holds that it is the One Brahman which is the Transcendent Reality. Bādarāyana openly refutes the Sāṅkhya doctrine which conceives Puruṣa and Prakṛti as two independent entities. The conception of Māyā as the illusory principle which shuts out the vision of the Brahman and reflects *It* as many, is a great contribution to the philosophical thought of the world. The world exists so long as the vision of the Brahman does not dawn upon us. While the Sāṅkhya maintains that the world is an evolution (*parināma*) of Prakṛti, the Vedānta holds that the world is an appearance (*vivarta*) of the Brahman.

Among the early teachers of Vedānta mention must be made of Gaudapāda who in his famous *Kārikās* has made a systematic treatment of the monistic Vedānta. Another important author is Bhairava (probably belonging to the first part of the seventh century A.D.) who is said to have written a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*. Yet another author hinted at by Śaṅkara is Bhairvipaṇca according to whom the Brahman is at once, one and dual. Besides him Śaṅkara speaks of one

Vṛttikāra, who remains even now unidentified¹

The greatest of all thinkers on monistic Vedānta is Sankara who, according to Professor Max Müller and other modern scholars, wrote his immortal *Sarirabhaṣya* during 788 A.D.—820 A.D. The orthodox tradition, however, assigns him to the latter half of the seventh century A.D. (686 A.D.—720 A.D.) Besides the philosophical insight which marks his writings, his style and diction have always lent a unique distinction to them. Sankara has written commentaries on the ten major Upaniṣads and his commentary on the *Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* has, in particular, attracted the attention of many an able thinker. Sankara's expositions have earned for him a distinction which may be described in this way that by the expression Vedānta we seem invariably to understand his views on it.

The *Sarirabhaṣya* was commented upon by two schools of thought known as

¹ Whether he is the same as Upavarsa a brother of Varṣa the teacher of Pīnini or Bodhīyana or whether the two sages are identical or whether there was a third author who passed as Vṛttikāra cannot be definitely ascertained.

the *Vivarana* school and the *Bhāmatī* school. The original source of the former school is found in the *Pañcapādikā* of Padmapāda who is said to have composed the commentary on the *first five quarters* (pādas) of the *Brahmasūtra-śārīrakabhāṣya* of which only the commentary on the *first four* Sūtras are now available. The age of Padmapāda is about the end of the seventh and the beginning of the eighth century A.D., as he is represented as the senior-most disciple of Śankara. The *Vivarana* which is a gloss on the *Pañcapādikā*, was composed by Prakāśātman (probably, ninth century A.D., 1200 A.D.) according to Professor Radhakrishnan. According to him the Brahman is both the content (*vr̥saya*) and the locus (*āśraya*) of Māyā Vidyāraṇya who is generally identified with Mādhaba (fourteenth century A.D.), wrote a summary on the *Vivarana* known as the *Vivaranaśāmeyasamgraha*.

The *Bhāmatī* school has been well represented in the *Bhāmatī* of Vācaspati, the *Kalpataru* and the *Śāstriadarpana* of Amalānanda (thirteenth century A.D.) and the *Parimala* of Appayyadikṣita (sixteenth seventeenth century A.D.).

The literature on monistic Vedānta, as

interpreted by Śaṅkara, is extremely rich. Suresvara (who is traditionally identified with Mandana who later became a disciple of Śaṅkara), wrote his *Taittiriyopanisad bhāṣyavarttīta*, *Bṛhadāraṇyalabhaṣyavarttīta* and *Nārāyaṇyasiddhi* about the end of the seventh or the beginning of the eighth century A.D.¹ Mandana's *Brahmasiddhi* is an outstanding work in which he puts forward many original ideas. The *Samkhepasāraṇī* was written in verse by Saivaṇīśatmamuni in the ninth century A.D. The *Iṣṭasiddhi* of Avinuktatīrtha (or Vimuktatīrtha) is another notable work of the school. In 1190 A.D. Sri Hūrṣa who is noted for his trenchant logic and Advaita polemics, composed his *Khandanālambanālhadya*—a masterly contribution. In the thirteenth century A.D. Citsukha wrote on the same lines his *Pratyalattirāpiṇḍipīka* or *Citsulī*. In the fourteenth century A.D. Vidyāraṇya wrote his *Pañcadasī*, a highly popular work in verse and the *Jñānamūlāviveka* a work of considerable importance. Vidyāraṇya and his teacher Bhāratitīrtha jointly wrote the

Works on
Monistic
Vedānta

¹ Some would rather place him in the first half of the ninth century A.D.

Vaiyāsikanyāyamālā. The *Vedāntasāra* of Sadānanda, is a good manual of monistic Vedānta. It was composed in the fifteenth century A.D. Another epistemological manual on monistic Vedānta is the *Vedāntapariabhāṣā* which was composed by Dharmarājādhi-vaiṇīḍī in the sixteenth century A.D. His son Rāmakṛṣṇa (sixteenth-seventeenth century A.D.) wrote the commentary *Sīkhāmāni* on it. Ānandagñī's *Nyāyanuṇaya* (fourteenth century A.D.) and Govindānanda's *Ratnapiabhbā* (fifteenth century A.D.) are two other commentaries on Śāṅkara's *Brahmasūtiabhbāya*. Piākāśānanda's *Siddhāntamuktāvalī* (fifteenth century A.D.) and Appayyadīksita's *Nyāyarakṣāmāni* and *Siddhāntaleśasamgraha* are other valuable manuals of the monistic school. Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, a Bengali of the sixteenth century A.D., wrote his monumental work the *Advartasiddhi* which contains an intricate and abstruse criticism of the rival school of Madhvā as represented in the *Nyāyāmrta* of Vyāsatītha or Vyāsāraṇā (last part of the fifteenth century A.D.). The *Gaudabrahmānandī* or *Laghucandrikā* of Bīahmānanda, is a defence of the *Advartasiddhi* against the criticism of Rāmācārya.

(alias Rāmatīrtha or Vyāsarama) in his *Tarangini* (latter part of the sixteenth century A.D.)

The *Brahmasutras* of Bādarāyana have been differently interpreted by a number of great thinkers of different schools, all of whom wrote their works after Sankara. One such thinker was Bhāskara who wrote his *Bhāṣya* sometime about the end of the eighth or the first part of the ninth century A.D. Bhāskara was a champion of the doctrine of the simultaneous identity and difference (Bhedabhedavāda).

Schools of
Vedānta
(i) Bhāskara

(ii) Rama
nuja

Ramanuja is another great commentator on the *Brahmasutras* whose age is assigned to the eleventh century A.D. His philosophy is based on the doctrine of qualified monism (Visistadvitavāda) according to which God is the one Reality, but is a composite of the conscious individual selves and the non conscious material world. Rāmānuja's chief sources of inspiration were the Tamil Gāthās of the Ālvaras or Vaisnava saints of South India, the chief of them being Nāthamuni and Yāmunācarya (tenth century A.D.). The name of his commentary is the *Sribhāṣya*. The *Sūtāprakāśa*

of Sudarśana (thirteenth century A.D.) is a well-known gloss on the *Śrībhāṣya*. Venkata-nātha Vedāntadeśīka (thirteenth century A.D.) was perhaps the greatest successor of Rāmānuja. He was the author of the *Satādūṣanī*, the *Tattvatīkā* (a commentary on the *Śrībhāṣya*) and the *Seśvaraṇīmāṃsā*.

Nimbārka is another commentator on the *Brahma-sūtras*. His commentary is called the *Vedāntapāṇiyātāsanabha*. He advocates the doctrine of dualistic non-dualism (Dvaitādvaitavāda) which is somewhat akin to the view of Bhāskara with but minor technical differences. Nimbārka lived about the eleventh century A.D. His disciple Śrīnivāsācārya wrote a commentary known as the *Vedāntakaustubha*. Keśavakāśmīn, a follower of this school (fifteenth century A.D.), wrote a commentary on the *Gītā* known as the *Tattvaprakāśikā*.

One more commentator on the *Brahma-sūtras* is Madhva who was born in 1199 A.D. Besides the commentary he wrote, he justified his interpretation in another work called the *Anuvyākhyāna*. He advocates the theory of pure dualism (Dvaitavāda).

Yet another commentator is Vallabha who lived in the last part of the fifteenth

(iii) Nimbārka

(iv) Madhva

century and the first part of the sixteenth century A.D. His commentary is called the *Anubhāṣya*. The theory he advocates is pure non dualism (Suddhādvaitavādī). He looks upon the world as a reality which is in its subtlest form the Brahman.

Last, though not the least, is the school of the Gaudiya Vaisnavas who advocate the doctrine of inscrutable identify and difference (Acintyābhedābhedavāda). Though they call themselves a branch of the Mādhwī school yet in views they are more akin to the school of Nimbārlā and sometimes follow Sankara also. The school traces its origin to the teachings of Sri Kṛṣṇa Caitanya who flourished in Bengal in the sixteenth century A.D. In the Gaudiya Vaisnava school, Rūpa gosvāmin a contemporary and disciple of Sri Caitanya, was a great versatile scholar who wrote many works on drama, rhetoric and philosophy. His *Vaiṣṇavatattva*, a commentary on the tenth chapter of the *Bhagavata*, is an important contribution to the literature of the Gaudiya Vaisnavas. His nephew and disciple Jīvāgosthāmin also was a great scholar and a prolific writer. His six *Sandarbhas* (*Kramasandarbhā*, *Tattvasandarbhā*, *Bhaktisandarbhā*, etc.,) and

(v) Gaudiya

the *Sarvasamvādī* are outstanding works on Gaudiya Vaisnava philosophy. Baladeva Vidyābhūṣana (eighteenth century A.D.) wrote the *Gorundabhaṣya*, the commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*, written according to the Gaudiya Vaisnava point of view. His *Prameyaratnākāra* is also a popular work.

B

HETERODOX SYSTEMS

The Buddhists are the followers of Gotama Buddha who preached his doctrines in the language of the people sometime in the sixth and the fifth centuries B.C. The Buddhist Canonical literature or the *Tripitaka* which was written in Pāli, has three divisions (1) the *Vinayapitaka*, (2) the *Suttapitaka* and (3) the *Abhidhammapitaka*. Besides the Canonical works, the Buddhist literature possesses a rich number of non-Canonical works which were also written in Pāli. It must be mentioned here that the Buddhist literature has a still wider scope and it includes fairly a long list of Sanskrit works an account of which has already been set forth in a previous chapter¹.

I
Buddhism
Introduc-
tion

¹ Chap V, pp 51-75

The Buddhist philosophers are broadly divided into the *four* schools—the Sautrāntikas, the Vaibhāsikas, the Mādhyamikas and the Yogācāras. Like Jainism, Buddhism also does not accept the authority of the Vedas. The Buddhists acknowledge only *two* means of knowledge—perception and inference. Though there are sharp lines of demarcation among the *four* schools referred to above, they are unanimous in their attitude against Brāhmanic culture. I tsing, the Chinese traveller, says—Those who worship the Bodhisattvas and read the Mahayanasūtras are the Mahayānists and those who do not perform such acts, are the Hinayānists. The Mahāyānists are divided into *two* branches—(1) Mādhyamika and (2) Yogacāra. The Hinayānists also have *two* divisions—(1) Vaibhāsika and (2) Sautrantika. Both are called Sarvastivādins.

Four schools of Buddhism

The Vaibhāsikas reject the authority of the Sūtras and attach themselves to the *Vibhaṣa*, the commentary on the *Abhidharma*. ^{(1) Vaibha} *mma*. Katyayaniputra's *Jñanapriasthana* (composed about three hundred years after Buddha's Nirvana) is their chief work. The commentary *Mahavibhaṣa* was compiled by five hundred Arhats led by Vasumitra, pro-

śīka

bably after the great council under Kaniska. Fragments of *Udānavagga*, *Dhammapada*, *Ehottarāgama*, Aśvaghosa's *Buddhacarita* and Āryaśūra's *Jātakamālā* seem to belong to this school. Bhadanta (third century A.D.) Dharmatīrtha and Ghoṣaka are other prominent exponents of this school.

According to Hiuen Tsang (Yuan Chwang) Kumāralāta (or Kumāralabdhā), a contemporary of Nāgārjuna, was the founder of the Sautrāntika school. The Sautrāntikas derive their name from the fact that they take their stand on the Sūtras. To be precise, unlike the Vaibhāṣikas, they adhere to the *Suttapitaka*, (the section consisting of the discourses of Lord Buddha) to the rejection of the two other Piṭakas. It is unfortunate that all works of this school are no longer extant. Dharmottara, the logician, and Yaśomitra, the author of the commentary on Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakosa*, are said to be the followers of this school.

The founder of the Mādhyamika school was Nāgārjuna who is said to have written the *Śatasāhasrākāra*, the latest of the Mahāyānasūtras. It may be mentioned in this connection that the *Prajñāpāramitās* declare that the highest wisdom consists of

(ii) *Sautrāntika*

(iii) *Mādhyamika*

the knowledge of Void (*Sunyata*). The most representative work of the Mādhyamika school is the *Madhyamikāvivarta* or the *Madhyamikasutra* of Nāgājuna which consists of four hundred verses in twenty seven chapters. Nāgājuna wrote a commentary of his own work which is named the *Akutobhaya*. Unfortunately the work has not come down to us in Sanskrit. Among other works written by Nāgājuna are the *Yuktisāra*, the *Sunyatasaptati*, the *Pratyasamutpadahṛdaya*, the *Mahayanaavimśala* and the *Vigrahavyavartanī*. Nāgājuna is usually placed between the first century B.C. (according to the tradition preserved in the archives of the Dāru Library) and the fourth century A.D. (according to Dr. S. C. Vidyābhūṣan). In my case he cannot be later than 401 A.D. when Kumārajīva translated his life into Chinese. Sāntideva (seventh century A.D.), the author of the *Bodhicaryavatara* and the *Silasamuccaya* is named sometimes as a Mādhyamika and sometimes as an advocate of the Yogacāra doctrine. The commentary named the *Praśannapada*, written by Candrakīrti in the sixth or the seventh century A.D., is an important contribution to the Mādhyamika literature. Āryadeva who

is a disciple of Nāgājuna, wrote the *Catusśataka* which is another important work of the Mādhyamika school. It was commented on by Candrakīrti. Other works by Āryadeva are the *Cittavivuddhiprakarana*, the *Hastavālaprakarana* and two other small treatises constituting a kind of commentary on some sections of the *Lankāvatāra*.

The founder of the Yogācāra school was Maitreyanātha, the teacher of Asanga who is generally believed to have clearly expressed the implications of his system. Asanga is at least as late as the third century A.D., though some would place him in the fourth or the fifth century A.D. According to the Yogācāra school nothing exists beyond consciousness (*vijñāna*). The *Abhisamayālankārakārikā* and probably the text of the *Mahāyānasūtrālankāra* attributed by Professor Lévi to Asanga and the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*, a prose work after the manner of the *Abhidharma* text, are the works of Maitreyanātha.¹ Asvaghosa

¹ The name of Asanga has become more famous than that of his teacher Maitreyanātha. This explains why the works of the latter are attributed to the former. According to the Tibetans and Hiuen Tsang the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* has been ascribed to Asanga.

was a follower of the Yogācāra school who wrote among other works the *Mahayanasaddhotpadasutri* is detailed in a previous chapter¹ Vasubandhu Asanga is a great name in Buddhist literature who is assigned to the fourth century AD, though some place him in the fifth century AD. His work the *Abhidharmaloka* in six hundred verses which has not reached us in the Sanskrit original is a lasting contribution to Buddhist philosophy. In this work the author has refuted chiefly the views of the Vaisheshikas. The Sāṅkhya theory has been criticized in his *Parīmārthasaptati*. Yaso mitra wrote a commentary on the *Abhidharmaloka* known as the *Abhidharmaloka Vyakhya* the earliest translation of which into Chinese was done in the sixth century AD. The work is highly important as it enables us to know the views of the Vaibhāsikas and the Sautrāntikas. Vasubandhu wrote his monumental treatise the *Vijñaptimatratusuddhi* consisting of two works the *Vimsatikā* and the *Triṃśikā* which explain the doctrine of the reality of consciousness. A few other works viz., *Pañcasandhahapīṭalāraṇa*, the *Vyākhyayulī*

¹ Ch V p 66

the *Karmasiddhiśrakarana* and two commentaries on the *Mahāyānasūti ālankāra* and the *Pratītyasamutpādasūtra*, the *Madhyāntavibhāga* and the *Aparimitāyussūti opadeśa* are said to have been written by Vasubandhu. Among the adherents to the school of Vasubandhu mention must be made of Sthūlamati, Dignāga, Dharmapāla and Śilabhadra. Sthūlamati wrote a commentary on Vasubandhu's *Tiṁśikā-Viññapti* while Dharmapāla had a commentary on the *Viñśatikā-Viññapti*. Dignāga was the disciple of Vasubandhu, brother of Ārya Asanga. Dignāga's date also is not accurately fixed. Thus while some assign him to the fifth century A.D., others place him between 520 A.D. and 600 A.D., and make him a contemporary of Gunaprabha, the teacher of King Śrī-Haiṣa of Kanauj Mallinātha, the famous commentator of the fifteenth century A.D., seems to find a reference to this Dignāga in Kalidāsa's *Meghadūta*. Dignāga's *Pramānasamuccaya*, *Pramānaśāstriapravesa* and other works are preserved in Tibetan translations, and are very popular in Japan. The only Sanskrit work of Dignāga which has recently come down to us is the *Nyāyapravesa* Dharmakīrti (sixth or

seventh century A.D.) wrote a valuable work the *Nyayabindu* which was commented on by Dharmottara (ninth century A.D.) in his *Nyayabinduṭṭa*. Silabhadra (seventh century A.D.) was the head of the Buddhist Vihara at Nalanda and Yuan Chwang (Hiuen Tsang) acquired from him his knowledge of Buddhist philosophy. Sāntaraksita in the eighth century A.D. wrote a voluminous work, the *Tattvasamgraha*, in which he has criticized the views of many rival schools of philosophers. His work was commented on by Kamalasila in his *Pañcika*.¹

The Jinas are the followers of Jain which is a title applied to Vardhamāna the last prophet Vardhamāna said that he was the expounder of tenets that had been successively held by twenty three earlier sages. The Jinas are divided into two schools (1) Svetāmbara (white robed) and (2) the Digambara (sly robed or nude). We are told that this division took place as early as the first century A.D. The

II
Jainism

Two schools

¹ A late treatise on the Buddhist philosophy is the work of Advayavajra who is assigned to the close of the eleventh or the beginning of the twelfth century A.D.

Śvetāmbara Jainas possess both Canonical and philosophical works, while the Dīgambara Jainas have no Canonical literature. The Canonical literature of the Śvetāmbara sect comprises *eighty-four* books among which *forty-one* are Sūtras. Both the schools disregard the authority of the Veda and are, therefore, called heterodox schools of philosophy by the orthodox Hindu philosophers.

The earliest Dīgambara author who is also held in high esteem by the Śvetāmbara sect, is Kundakunda whose works are all written in Pākīt. The first known Dīgambara writer in Sanskrit, is Umāsvāmin, also called Umāsvāti (third century A.D.) whose *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra* (in ten chapters) is regarded as an authoritative text by both sects. Siddhasena Divākara is also a well-known Dīgambara philosopher who wrote probably in the fifth century A.D. His commentary on the *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra* and his two other works the *Nyāyāvatāra* and the *Sammatitarasūtra* are all important contributions. In the first half of the eighth century A.D., Samantabhadra, a Dīgambara, wrote a commentary on the *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra* which contains an

introduction called the *Āptamimamsa* which was known both to Kumārila and Vācaspati Sūnūtabhadra's other works *Yultya* *nuśasana* and *Ratnakarandaśāra* *alacara*. To the same century in all probability lived Akalanka whom, whose works the *Tattvartharajavarttika* and the *Asaṅgati* commentaries on the *Tattvarthadhigamasutra* and the *Āptamimamsa* respectively, may be mentioned. His views were strongly opposed by Kumārila. It was Vidyārūḍhi who defended Akalanka against the criticisms of Kumārila by writing the *Asaṅgasasri*, the *Tattvarthaslokavarttika*, the *Āptapariṣṭa*, the *Patrapariṣṭa*, the *Pramanapariṣṭa* and the *Pramananirnaya*. Māṇikyānandin wrote his *Parikṣamulhasutra* which is based on the *Nyayavimicaya* of Akalanka. Prabhācandra who is said to be a pupil of Kundakunda wrote two independent works on logic, the *Prameyakamalamartanda* and the *Nyayakumudacandrodaya*. It is usually believed that Prabhācandra was a pupil of Akalanka, but it is stated in the epilogue of the *Prameyakamalamartanda* that the work was composed during the reign of Bhoja of Dhāra. Subhacandra is another Digambara Jain who wrote his

Tīānārnava, a philosophical work in verse, at the close of the eighth or the beginning of the ninth century A.D.

Haribhadra is the earliest Śvetāmbara Jaina philosopher who wrote two important works, the *Saddarśanasamuccaya* and the *Lokatattvanivaya*, besides a commentary on the *Nyāyapraśna* of Dignāga, the *Yogadrśisamuccaya*, the *Yogabindu* and the *Dharmabindu*. His date is believed to be the ninth century A.D. Towards the close of the ninth century A.D. Amṛtacandra wrote the *Tattvārthasāra* and the *Puruṣārtha-siddhyupāya* besides a few commentaries. Hemacandra is a great Jaina philosopher whose *Pramānamīmāṃsā* is an important work on Jaina philosophy. Mallisena in the thirteenth century A.D. wrote his *Syādvāda mañjari*, a commentary on Hemacandra's *Anyayogavyavacchedikā*. To the same century belongs Āśādhara among whose works mention should be made of the *Dharmāmrta*. Devendrasūri, another writer of the same century, wrote the *Siddhapañcāśikā*, the *Vandāuvrtti* and the *Upamitibhavapiapañcā-kathā-sāroddhāra*. In the fifteenth century Sakalakīrti wrote a voluminous work the *Tattvārthasāradīpaka* in twelve

Chapters To the same century belonged Srutasagara who wrote the *Jinendra yajñavidhi* and the *Tattvāthadipīla*. In the seventeenth century flourished Yaso vijaya who wrote the *Jñanabinduprālāraṇa* and the *Jñanasara*.

The substance of the doctrine of the Indian materialists is aptly and very briefly summed up in the allegorical drama, the *Prabodhacandrodaya*—‘Lokayata is the only Sāstria. In this system perceptual evidence is the only authority. The elements are four in number—earth, water, fire and wind. Wealth and enjoyment are the objects of human existence. Matter can think. There is no other world. Death is the end of all.’ *Lokayata* (directed to the world of enjoyment through senses) is the Sanskrit expression for materialism. It is the name of the Sāstria. The materialists are called *Lokayatikas* or *Carvākis* called as such after the name of the founder of the school.

Carvāka’s story is found in the *Mahabharata* while the doctrine is referred to in the *Mahabharata* (*Salyaparvan* and *Santi parvan*), the *Vishnupurana* and the *Manu smṛti*, as that of the Nihilists and the

III
Materialism
(Carvaka)

Introduction

References
to Cārvāka
philosophy

Heretics Sometimes Cārvāka is identified with Br̥haspati, who incarnated himself as an atheist in order to bring ruin unto the demons. The classic authority on the materialist theory is said to be the *Sūtras* of Br̥haspati, which have perished. The *Saṃadarśanasamgraha* of Mādхava gives a summary of the teaching of the school in its first chapter. Fragmentary quotations of *Sūtras* and passages from works of the school now lost to us, can be traced in the polemical works of other philosophical schools.

Among the earlier heretical teachers, mention may be made of Sañjaya the sceptic, Ajita Keśakambalin the materialist, Purāna Kāśyapa the indifferentist, Maskarin Gosāla the fatalist and Kakuda Kātyāyana the elementalist.

The materialists, again, were subdivided into several schools those who identified the body with the self, those who confused the self with the external senses, those who regarded the internal organ (*antahkarana*) as their self and so on. The oft-quoted verses quoted by Mādхava, give a popular view of the materialists "While the life remains, let a man live happily, let him feed on

Early
teachers

Schools of
Materialism

else, even if he runs in debt when once the body becomes ashes, how can it ever return again? The three authors of the *Vedas* were the hypocrites knaves and might prowlers etc etc

C

MISCELLANEOUS WORKS ON PHILOSOPHY

Srikanthabha yī a commentary on the *Brahm isutri* by Srikantha alias Nilakantha (thirteenth or fourteenth century AD)—written from the *Vishishtadvaita* point of view—much in the same line as that adopted by Ramanuja—commented on by Appayya diksita in his *Smaraka manudipītri* (It is said that Appayya was at first a *Sivaita* and later was converted into an *Advaitin*)

Sriharabhasya a commentary on the *Brahm isutri* by Sripati Pandit representing the *Dvaitādvaita* point of view

Commentaries on the Gītā (named *Subodhini*) the *Bhāgarata* and the *Viśnupravāna* by Srihṛishvāmin (twelfth or thirteenth century AD)—who is claimed to be an exponent of the *Suddhādvaita* school inasmuch as he refers to

Viśnusvāmin the founder of the Suddhādvaita school in the commentary on the *Bhāgavata* [Vallabhaśācārya (fifteenth-sixteenth century A.D.) was a later exponent of this school. But as he has also referred to Citsukha, it may also be possible that he was a thinker of the Advaita school, who was rather inclined to the doctrine of Devotion (*Bhakti*). This sort of compromise between the doctrines of Devotion (*Bhakti*) and Knowledge (*Jñāna*) is also found later in the *Bhaktiśāyana* of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī who was a sturdy champion of the Advaita philosophy.]

Sarvadarśana-saṃgraha

by Mādhabāśācārya who along with his brother Sāyana, the celebrated commentator of Vedic literature, was in the court of Kings Harihara and Viśa Bukka of Vijayanagara (fourteenth century A.D.) and subsequently turned a Sannyāsin and passed his days in the Śingerī Matha a valuable encyclopaedia of Indian philosophy, which contains the summary of the views of at least seventeen different orthodox and heterodox schools of Indian philosophy.

Sarvasiddhānta sārasaṁgraha ascribed to Sankarīcīrya but seems to be the work of a more modern hand who was possibly one of the later chiefs of the Sankara Maṭha—a work in the line of the *Sarīadarśaṇa-saṁgraha* though written in easy verses

Vijñānāṁṛta-bhāṣya by Vijñānabhikū (sixteenth century A D) who by writing this commentary on the *Brahma-sūtras* tried to make in the body of this work a sort of compromise between the Sīkhya and Yoga views on one hand and the Vedāntic (Upaṇiṣadic) views on the other

Saktibhāṣya by Pañcīnāna Tarkaṇatn of the twentieth century A D—an ingenious work in the form of a commentary on the *Brahma-sūtras*. It does not however strictly conform to the orthodox Śāktīgama standpoint

REFERENCES

Das Gupta S N History of Indian Philosophy
 Vols I II & III

Keith A B A History of Sanskrit Literature

Radhakrishnan S Indian Philosophy Vols I & II

Winternitz M A History of Indian Literature Vol II

APPENDIX

HISTORY OF THE STUDY OF SANSKRIT IN THE WEST

It was in the seventeenth century that the European people particularly missionaries and travellers came to know of the Indian languages. In 1651 A.D. Abraham Rozer published a Portuguese translation of Bhāskara's poems. In 1699 A.D. the Jesuit Father Johann Ernst Hanxleden came to India and after getting himself acquainted with the Sanskrit language wrote the first Sanskrit grammar in a European language. The book however was not printed but was consulted by Fra Paolino de St Bartholomeo who wrote two Sanskrit grammars besides a number of important works. It was during the administration of Warren Hastings that the work called *Vividhānavasetu* was compiled. Under the title A Code of Gentoo Law it was published in English in 1776 A.D. Nine years later the *Bhagavatadgītā* was translated into English by Charles Wilkins who also rendered into English the *Hitopadesa* and the Sakuntalā episode of the *Mahābhārata*. It was however Sir William Jones who did most to arouse the interest of Europeans in Indian literature. In 1789 A.D. he published his English translation of Kalidasa's *Sakuntala* and this was followed by his translation of the *Manusmīti* the most important legal literature of ancient India. It was again through his enthusiasm that the *Ritusamhāra* of Kālidāsa was published in the original text in 1792 A.D. The English translation of Kālidāsa's works by Sir William Jones was followed by the German translation of *Śaluntala* by Georg Forster in 1791 which attracted the attention of men like Herder and Goethe. The work of Jones was followed up by Henry Thomas Colebrooke who

published 'A Digest of Hindu Law on Contracts and Successions' based on a composition in Sanskrit by orthodox Indian scholars. He also edited a number of Sanskrit works including the *Amarakośa* the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* the *Hitopadeṣa* and the *Kuṇālāṇḍuṇīya*. Another Englishman who studied Sanskrit in India was Alexander Hamilton who, while returning to England in 1802 A.D., was imprisoned with other Englishmen at Paris under orders of Napoleon Bonaparte. During the period of his imprisonment Hamilton trained up a band of European scholars who took to the study of Sanskrit with earnest zeal. This is commonly referred to as the 'Discovery of Sanskrit' in the West. One of Hamilton's most distinguished students was the great German scholar and poet Friedrich Schlegel, who wrote that epoch-making work 'On the Language and Wisdom of the Indians'. This work introduced for the first time the comparative and the historical method. It also contained translations in German of many passages from the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Bhagavadgītā*, the *Manusmīti* and other early works. Friedrich Schlegel's brother August Wilhelm von Schlegel, student of Professor A. L. Chezy the first French scholar in Sanskrit, not only contributed much to the study of Comparative Philology but also helped the study of Sanskrit by editing texts and writing translations. One of Schlegel's students was Christian Lassen who was deeply interested in Indian culture. The science of Comparative Philology was founded by Franz Bopp, a student of Professor Chézy and contemporary of August Wilhelm Bopp also rendered great service to the investigation of Sanskrit literature by incorporating in his work "Conjugations-System" translations from the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*. His Sanskrit Grammars considerably furthered the study of Sanskrit in Germany. The work of Bopp in the domain of Comparative Philology was developed in a most comprehensive manner by Wilhelm von Humboldt whose interest in the philosophical works of the

Indians was of an abiding character. Another noted German Fredrich Rückert was also highly interested in Indian poetry. The Latin translations of the Upaniṣads in the beginning of the nineteenth century inspired German philosophers Schelling Kant Schiller and Schopenhauer were highly charmed to discover the production of the highest human wisdom. The actual investigation of Vedic literature was first undertaken by Friedrich Rosen in 1838 and was subsequently continued by a band of illustrious students of the great French Orientalist Eugène Burnouf including Rudolf Roth and F Max Müller who brought out his famous *editio princeps* of the *Rgveda* with the commentary of Śivāya in the years 1849-70. One of Roth's distinguished students was H Grassmann who published a complete translation of the *Rgveda*. It was during this period that Horace Hayman Wilson who came to Calcutta represented the orthodox interpretation of the *Rgveda* by translating it on the lines of Śivāya's commentary. Similar work was done by Alfred Ludwig who is looked upon as a forerunner of R Pischel and K F Geldner the joint authors of Vedic Studies. The name of Theodor Aufrecht is also associated with Vedic investigations.

The publication of the great St Petersburg Dictionary (Sanskrit Wörterbuch) in 1852 is an important event in the history of progressive studies in Sanskrit in the West. The Dictionary was compiled by Otto Bohlinck and Rudolf Roth and published by the Academy of Fine Arts and Sciences St Petersburg. The History of Indian Literature which was published by Albrecht Weber in 1852 A.D. and was edited for the second time in 1876 A.D. is another important work. The edition of the *Śatapathabṛāhmaṇa* by the same author is another outstanding contribution. The Catalogus Catalogorum published by Theodor Aufrecht in the years 1891 1896 and 1906 forms a most comprehensive list of Sanskrit authors and works and is a monumental work of its kind.

Arthur Anthony Macdonell's 'Vedic Grammar' and 'Vedic Mythology' and the 'Vedic Index' by Macdonell and Arthur Berriedale Keith, have all proved helpful works for the study of Sanskrit in Europe Maurice Bloomfield's 'Vedic Concordance' is another great work which has been of immense help to Vedic studies in the West William Dwight Whitney's 'Sanskrit Grammar' is yet another important treatise Edward Byle Cowell, who was Principal, Government Sanskrit College, Calcutta, gave a distinct fillip to Sanskritic studies by his translations of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* and many other important San-krit works Arthur Venis, Principal, Government Sanskrit College, Benares, also did a lot to help Sanskritic studies Amongst European scholars who lived in India and took interest in Sanskrit learning and literature, mention may be made of J F Fleet, Vincent A Smith, Sir Alexander Cunningham, Sir John II Marshall, Sir M A Stein, Sir George Grierson and J Ferguson

Among later European scholars who have done invaluable service to the cause of Sanskrit studies the names of George Buhler, J Mun Frank Kielhorn, E Roer, H Lüders, Hermann Jacobi, E Senart, Sylvain Lévi, Edward Washburn Hopkins, E Hultzsch, Arthur Coke Burnell, Monier Williams, Theodor Goldstücker, Richard Garbe, Paul Deussen, Julius Eggeling, George Thibaut, Julius Jolly, and Maurice Winteritz are remembered by all lovers of Sanskrit

Of living western indologists, the more important names include F W Thomas, A B Keith, L D Barnett, T Tscheibatsky, Sten Konow, Vallee Poussin, Otto Strauss, C R Lanman and Giuseppe Tucci

INDEX

Abbayanandin 100
Abhidhānacintamani 171
Abhidhanaratnamalā 171
Abhidharmakosa 71 224 226 7
Abhidharmakośa 227
Abhidhārīttimatīlā 16
Abhijñānasalāntala 97 108
Abhinandā son of Jayanta 8
Abhinanda son of Śatīnanda 86
Abhinavabharati 163 16
Abhinavagupta 46 7_{on} 161
 163 16_o 167
Abhinayadarpana 193
Abhisamayalankārakārikā 71
 226
Abhivēka 102
Acintyabhedābheda 221
adbhuta 7_{on}
Abbhutadarpana 117
Abbhutasagara 191n
Adipurāna 85
Adīaitasiddhi 218
Advayavātrī 229n
Ādya Sakti 43
Agastimata 193
Agnipurāna 42 161n 171 173
Aśvabudhnyasamhita 16
Aihole inscription 91
Alayer G 53
Ājita Ke akambalin 234
Ākalanka 231
Ākhyātyākī 136 7
Alabhyālāyāha 69
Alutobhaya 70 225
Ālvārūni 32n 188
Alexander 89
Ālankāra 154 161 2 66
Ālankāralanda 81
Ālankārasamgraha 161
Ālankārasariṣṭa 167
Ālankārāsekhara 169
Ālola 198
Ālīras 319
Āmalīndra 217
Āmṛacandra 87 168
Āmarakosa 173 n
Āmaramangala 117
Āmarasumhi 136 173 71
Āmaru 193
Āmaru *ataka* 123
Āmitigati 127
Āmogha *ṛtti* 122
Āmṛtabhūrati 127
Āmṛtaacandra 232
Āmṛtamāntha 8
Āmṛtinanda 61
Ānandabhairava 46
Ānandagiri 213n 21^o
Ānandalahari 127
Ānandāvadhāni 83 111 124
 126 7 161 164 6, 167
Ānugāhar i *Mitrārīja* 111
Ānugaraṅga 183
Ānūta 147
Ānargha *īghara* 112
Āneśvarthasamgraha 174
Āneśvarthasamuccaya 171
Āniruddha *Putrārītti* 178
Āniruddha *Com* on *Sinkhya*
 sūtra 201
Ānukā 97 102
Ānunāmbhatta 201
Ānubhūrya 221
Ānubhūtisvārūpīcīrya 156
Ānuyūlāhyana 220
Ānyayogāryaiacchedika 232

Anyoktumuktālatuṣṭaka, 127
Apāntarātamas, 213n
Āpātmītāyussūtropadeśa, 228
Āpastamba, 175
Āpiśali, 147
Āpodeva, 211
Āppayyadikṣita, 169, 211, 216, 218, 235
Āptamīmīṣa, 231
Āptaparīkṣa, 231
Āśāmbhavāda, 202
Āśīsimha, 133, 168
Ārjunaiāvanīya 85
Ārjunavaīman, 124
Ārthasamgraha, 211
Ārthaśāstra, 99, 143, 180
Ārya Asanga, 71, 226, 226n, 228
Āryabhatta, 188-9
Āryabhatta, *Āryasiddhānta*, 188
Āryabhalīya, 188
Āryadeva, 71, 225
Āryāṣṭaptati, 127
Āryasiddhānta, 188
Āryāstasata, 188
Āryāśūla, 68, 146, 224
Āśādhara, 232
Āśtikāyavāda, 202
Āścārya upapīṭāna, 43
Āśmaīathya, 212
Āśoka, 53, 74
Āśokīvadīna, 73
Āśīma, 41
Āśīra, 216
Āstīdhūtī, 2, 20, 149, 149n, 150, 152-3, 158, n
Āstamīhīśīrcaityastīta, 126
Āstīnqasīmīgīra, 185
Āśīacīkītī, 192
Āśītaghōṣī, 49, 57, 59, 60, 65, 65n, 66n, 67, 71, 77, 99, 100, 100n, 224, 226
Āśvārādyaka, 192
Āśīāyūveda, 192
Ātharvāveda, 33, 88, 134, 187
Ātmatattvavivicha, 197
Ātreyā, ritual authority 184
Ātreyā, authority on medicine, 212
Āucītyācīcīna, 166
Āudulomī, 212
Auflecht, T., iii
Āvadāna, 65, 72-3
Āvadānākalpalatā, 74n
Āvadānāśā'aka, 73-4, 85
Āvaloka, 166
Āvīmānaka, 101
Āvīmuktātman 217
Āvīdarāvana 212 213n, 214, 219
Āvādāna, 212
Āvīhudantīpūra, 180
Bālabhūrata, Āśīmācandha, 87
Bīlabhūrata, Bhāsa, 112
Bīlīcārīta, 103 105
Baladeva, 213n, 222
Bīlāmanorūpā, 153
Bīlārūmīṣīana, 112
Bīlasubīrahmanyam I R, 78n
Bīlībandha, 99
Ballālasena, 145
Bānabhatta 34, 35, 85, 100, 109, 109n, 116, 120, 125-6, 138-9, 140-1 146-7
Bāneiji R D, 61n, 62n
Bānnett, L D, iv
Bauddhasamgrītyalankīra 138
Bhadanta, 224
Bhīdiākalpīradīna, 74
Bhagava lajīukīya, 114
Bhagavatgītī, 1
Bhīgāmīta, 42, 135, 221, 236
Bhaktī 169, 236
Bhaktīasīyana, 236

Bhaktisataka 128
Bhallata 127
Bhallatasataka 127
Bhāmaha 82 137 152 161 2
Bhamati 216
Bhāminīlusa 128
Bhāna 97 119
Bhandaikai R C 61n
Bhānikā 98
Bhānudatta 168
Bhānuji 173
Bharata 17 7n 85 160 1
 163 169 168
Bhūtarāmpū 147
Bhūratacandra 124
Bharatamāṇī 86
Bhūnavi 81 93
Phartihari 82 122 3 127 8
 151 154 214
Bhartimentha 84
Bhartimitra 208
Bhartiprapāñca 214
Bhīsa 97 99 100 1
Bhūṣapariñcheda 201
Bhūsarvajī 197
Bhūṣuti 158
Bhāṣīlara upapurana 43
Bhāskara Unmattaraghāra 117
Bhāskara philosopher 219 20
Bhāskarīcarya 189
Bhūsiati 189
Bhu ya *Bhūskara* 219
Bhūṭacintamani 211
Bhūttadipika 211
Bhuttanīyana 111 2
Bhuttanīyaka 164
Bhūttakahasya 211
Bhatti 82 85 6 137 151
Bhūtīlāvya 76n 81 137 157
Bhattoji 153 4 159
Bhāṭotpala 190
Bhaumīka 85
Bhavabhūti 90 92 97 109 12
 114
Bhavādīsa 208
Bhavañdevabhatta 177 210
bhūtakatva 164
Bhīvamīra 156
Bhavāñtha 209
Bhāvanāvīeka 211
Bhāvapīkāsa 186
Bhāvaprakasana 167
Bhavendrasūri 87
bhayānuka 75n
Bhayabhrūjana arman 191n
Bhedabhedavīda 219
Bhela 185
Bhūkkhūpācittiya 3
Bhūkkhūpācittiya 3
Bhimata 114
Bhī medalion 78n
Bhoja 166 7 181 159 193
 206 207n
Bhojadeva 124 231
bhojakatīa 164
Bhojaprabandha 145
Bhojāñja 147
Bhrgu 176
bībhatsa 70n
Bijaganīta 189
Bilhan 114 124 131
Bilamangala 127
Bindumati 98
Bloomfield M m
Bodhīyanī 208 210n
Bodhīyanakavi 114
Bodhīcaryānatūra 230
Bohtlingk O m
Bopp F n
Brahmadatta 56
Brahmagupta 188 189
Brahmīnanda 224
Brahmanasariāsava 178
Brahmāṇḍaputāna 42

Brahmapurīna, 42
Brahmasiddhi, 217
Brahmasphutasiiddhānta, 188
Brahmasūti, 135, 212, 213n,
 214, 219-20, 222, 235
Brahmasūtrabhāṣya, 218
Brahmavāvai tapuūna, 42
Bṛhadabhedenduśekhara, 154
Bṛhadāranyakabhaṛyavāntīka,
 217
Bṛhadāranyakalcpaṇīśad, 215
Bṛhajjūtaka, 190
Bṛhaspati, 180, 234
Bṛhaspatismūti, 177
Bṛhadbhāmasamhitū, 46
Bṛhatī, 209
Bṛhatkathā, 101, 104, 142-3
Bṛhatkathāmañjari, 142
Brhatsamhitū, 190, 193
 Buddha, 53-8, 63, 65, 195n,
 222-4
 Buddhabhatta, 193
Buddhacarita, 57, 60, 63, 65,
 77, 78n, 224
 Buddhaghosa, 84
Buddhāvatamsaka, 70
 Budhasvāmin, 142
 Buhler, G, 1, 5, 5n, 7, 8, 122n,
 176, iv
 Burnell, A C, 149n, iv
 Bunouf, E, iii
Cartanyacandīodaya, 116
Cartanyūmi ta, 158
 Cakrapānidatta, 185
Campakaśīsthikathānaka, 145
 Cānakya, 143, 180, 184
Candakauśika, 113
Candeśvara, 178, 181
Candī, 42
Cāṇḍīdāsa, 167
Candīśatāka, 126
 Candī, Candīaka, 114
 Cāndīa school, 155
Candīagomin, 114, 152, 154-5
Candīakūti, 72n, 225-6
Candīloka, 168-9
Cāraṇa, 135, 181-5, 202, 207n
Cāraṇasamhitā, 181, 195n, 207n
Cārucaṇyātaka, 127
Cāruḍatta, 104-5
Cārvāka, 233-4
 Catalogus Catalogorum, iii
Catūrīṣīgacintūmanī, 178
Catūrīṣīgasamīkha, 127
Catūrīṣītaka, 71, 2-6
Catūrīṣītakastotra, 67
Cāvapāñcāśikā, 124
Chandomañjarī, 172
Chando'nuśīsuna 172
Chāṇū, 206
 Chézy, A L, ii
 Cidambāra, 87
Cikitsākalikā, 186
Cikitsāśūrasamīkha, 185
Citrabhaṭīata, 115
Citrāmīmāṃsā, 169
 Citsukha, 217, 236
Citsukhī, 217
Cittāśuddhiprākāra, 71, 226.
 Colebrooke, T, 158, i
 Conjugations-system, ii
 Cowell, E B, iv
 Cunningham, A, 9, 10, 53, iv
 Dalai-Lama, 225
 Dallana, 185
Dāmodara, 193
Dāmodaraugupta, 126
Dāmodarāmīśī, 113
 Dandin, 4, 9, 105n, 136-8, 142, 162-3.
Dāśpadalana, 127
Dāśabhaṭīmaka, 70
Dāśagītikūśūti, 188
Dāśakarīmapaddhati, 178
Dāśakumāracarīta, 105n, 137

Ganapātha, 155
Ganarātnamahorādhū, 158
Ganvistotragīthā 65
Gangādāsa, 172
Gangātaharī, 128
Gangēśa, 197-8
Gārbe, R., 196n, 203 iv
garbha, 95
Gāngya, 149, 203
Garvālapurāna, 42 193
Gāthā, 51, 58, 69
Gāthāśaptasatī, 120
Gauda, 110, 130
Gaudabrahmīnandi, 218
Gaudapāda, 203, 214
Gauḍapādakarikā, 214
Gaudarāha, 110, 130
Gaudiya Vaishnavas, 221, 222
Gautama, 175 195, 195n, 196,
 200
Gayadīsa, 185
Geldner, F., 93, iii
Ghatakarpaṇa, 122
Ghatakarparakāṇya, 122
Ghosaka, 221
Ghosh, Amobinda, 122n
Gnānār inscription, 48
Gitā, 32, 220, 235
Gitagovinda, 125 183
Goethe, 106, 121, i
Gokulikas, 54-5
Goldstucker, T., 2, 149, iv
Gopūlacakampū, 147,
Gopendra Tippa Bhūpāla 163
Gopinātha, 117
Gosthī, 98
Govardhana, 127
Govinda, 167, 169
Govindabhaṣya, 222
Govindānanda, 218
Govindarāja, 177
Grassmann, H., iii
Gṛhvasutri, 174
Guerison, G. iv
Guna, 163.
Gunabhadrī, 55, 165
Gunīdhya, 101, 142
Gunaprabha, 225
Gunaratna, 203n
Hīla 120, 127
Halayudha, 86, 174 178
Hallīśa 95
Hamilton, A., ii
Hammīramalāmardana 116
Hamsadūta, 121n
Hamsavandea, 121n
Hanumānīlaka, 113
Hanūdēden J. E., i
Hariadatta, 152
Hariadattasūti, 57
Harihelīnīlaka 115
Hārīnālī, 173
Hariṇīyaya, 76n 85
Hari, 82, 208
Haribhadra, 232
Haricandra, 86 147
Haridikṣita, 159
Hariṇīmīmīta, 158
Hārīta, 173
Hariṇīmīta, 32, 99, 103
Hariṇīmīta, court-epic, 87
Hariṇīmīrapurāna, 85
Hariṇīlāsa, 86
Hariṣa, 108-9, 109n, 140
Hariṣacarita, 38, 109, 120 140
Hariṣadeva 127 132
Hariṣakūti, 191
Hastabīlaprakarana 226
Hastīyāyīveda, 192
hāsyā 75n
Hāsyacūḍāmāni, 115
Hāsūtīnava, 117
Hathayoga, 207
Paṇaṇīrīvavādha, 84

Hemacandra 86 127 132 150
 158 167 8 172 174 181
 232
 Hemīdu 13n 178
 Heroic 95 110
 Heide 1
 Hertel T 93n
 Hillebrandt A 92n
 Hinayāna 52 56 73
 Hiranyakesin 179
Hitopadea 143 1 n
 Hiuen Tsang 21 224 226n 229
 Hopkins E W 36n iv
 Horū 190
Horāsastra 190
Horāsatapañcasikā 190
Hydayadarpana 164
 Hultsch E iv
 Humboldt W von n
 Ihāmiga 97 115
 Indra 149n
 Indradhvaja 88 91
 Introduction to Pūrvamīmāṃsa 212n
Ist iddu 217
Isvaraikrsna 106 203 205n
Isvarasamhitā 46
 I tsing 60 151 185 225
 Jacobi H 24 26 27n 29 32
 36 196n 208 iv
 Jagaddeva 191n
 Jagadisa 198 201
 Jagadisvara 117
Jagālīcarita 133
 Jagannītha 128 159 161 170
 Jaimini 208 212
Jaiminiyāyamālā 211
Jaina Mahābhārata 87
Jaina Rāmāyana 86
 Jainendra 150
 Jaiyyata 185
 Jalhana 128
Jambūativijaya 84
Jānakīharana 82
Jānakīpāṇimaya 116
Jātakamīlu 68 146 224
 Jayadattī 192
 Jayadeva 124 127 183 198
 Jayadeva Berar 11
Jayadeva Candrālola 168 9
Jayāditya 151 152
Jayamāntalā 182
Jayanītīyana 202
 Jayanta 85 197
 Jayaratha 167
Jayasimha 116
 Jha Ganganath 208
Jīmūtavīthani 179
 Jinadīsa 87
 Jinakuti 11
Jin-sena *Hariyamāpurana* 85
Jinasena *Mahāpurāna* 95
Jinasena *Pāśāñbhyudaya* 85
 Jinendrabuddhi 83 152 15
Jinendriayañavudhi 232
 Jivagosvīmin 8 147 169 221
 Jivaka 184
Jīlandharacampū 149
Jīvanmulātivīchā 217
Jīvīna 236
Jīvīnabinduprakarana 233
Jīvīnīmṛitasamhitā 46
Jīvīnaprasthāna 223
Jīvīnārnāra 47 232
Jīvīnasāra 233
Jīvīnendriasarasvat 153
 Jolly J 27n iv
 Jones W 78n 79n 125
 Jumaranandin 157
 Jyotirisvara 182
Jyotirīdyūbha ana 191
Jyotivāsāroddhāra 191
Kādambani 138 140
Kādambanikathīsura 89

Kaivalya, 206
Kaiyata, 152, 154
Kakudakātyāyana, 230
Kalūpa, 156
Kalūvilāsa, 127
Kalmaṇa, 110, 129, 131
Kālidāsa, 49, 50, 77, 77n, 80n,
 81, 83-4, 97-8, 100, 105-11,
 120, 122, 122n, 125, 171,
 228, 1.
Kūlikāpuraṇa, 43
Kālīvīlāsa 47
Kalkipuraṇa, 43
Kalpadrumūvadānamūlā 14
Kalpanālankārīkā, 65n
Kalpanāmanditikā, 65n
Kalpataru, 216
Kalyānamalla, 183
Kalyānamandīastotra, 126
Kāmadattā, 98
Kāmadhenu, 163
Kamalākaiabhatta, 179 212
Kamalaśīla, 222
Kāmandaka, 181
Kāmasūtra, 81, 182
Kamsavadha, 99
Kamsavadha, Sesakīśīna, 116
Kanakāratīmūḍhava, 98
Kaniska, 58-9, 70, 184, 224
Kanabhakṣa, 200
Kanabhuk, 200
Kanāda, 200-1
Kant, 111
Kapila, 43, 203-4
Kapphanūbhīyudaya, 85
Karanakutūhala, 189
Kārandavyūha, 69
Kārikā, Īśvalakīśīna, 203n
Kārikāvalī, 201
Karmaśatka, 73
Karmasiddhiprakarana, 228
Karnabhāra, 102
Kānasundari 114
Kāpūracarita, 97, 115
Kāpūramāñjari, 98, 113
Kāpuna, 75n
Kāśīnājīni, 212
Kāśakitsna, 212
Kāśīkāvīvaraṇapāñjilī, 152
Kāśīkāvītti, 82, 151-2, 210
Kāśyapa, 200
Kāṣṭapasamhitū, 193
Kātantisasūtrā, 156
Kathā, 136
Kāthakasamhitū, 33
Kathākautuka, 114
Kathākośa 145
Kathānūra, 145
Kathāsairitsūgata, 104, 106, 142
Kātyāyana 20, 150
Kātyāyanīputra, 223
Kaumāra, 156
Kaumudīmītrānanda, 115
Kaundabhatta, 159
Kautilya, 99, 143, 180
Kautukasavasra, 117
Kavīhalpalatū, 168
Kavīkāntībhāraṇa, 166
Kavīkānapūra 116
Kavīndhavacanasamuccaya, 127
Kavīputra, 105
Kavīrahasya, 86
Kavīrāja, 85
Kavīśekhaṇa, 116
Kavītūrahasya, 168
Kāvya, 98
Kāvyādasi, 105, 105n, 136, 142,
 162
Kāvyakalpataru, 168
Kāvyaśālankāra Bhāmaha, 161
Kāvyaśālamkāra, Rudiata, 162
Kāvyaśālankārasūtra, 163
Kāvyaśāmānsā, 165
Kāvyaśākāśa, 163, 167

Kavyanusasana Hemacandra 167
Kavyanusasana Vigbhāta 168
Kedarabhatta 179
 Keith A B 99 114 143 + 200
 208 iii
Keliravataka 98
 Kennedy 60n
 Kern H 58 9 69
Kesavakīsmīra 220
Kesavamīra rhetorician 169
Kesavamīra Nāīyikā 201
Khandadeva 211
Khanḍakhadyaka 188
Khanḍalakhanḍakhadya 217
Kharoṣṭha 8
Kharoṣṭhi 6 7 9
 Kielhorn F 122n iv
Kiranarāti 201
Kiratarjuniya court epic 81 ii
Kiratarjuniya drama 115
Kirtīlaumudi 132
Kirtīlata 182
Kokkoha 182
 Konow S 60n 62n 106 109n
 iv
 Korur theory 60n
Kramadīvara 107
Kṛīlurasatala 98
Kṛṣṇakarnamīta 127
Kṛṣṇamīra 113
Kṛṣṇananda īgāmavīgīsa 198
Kṛṣṇa yajurveda 134 176
Kṛṣṇa yajvan 211
Kṣemarāja 46
Kṣemendra 74n 84 86 115
 127 142 166 172 182
Kṣemendra grammarian 157
Kṣemīvara 113
Kṣirasvamī 173
Kulacudamani 47
Kularnava 47
Kulluka 177
Kumāra 82
Kumārajīva 225
Kumaralabdhā 224
Kumāralītī 65n 224
Kumārasambhāra 78
Kumārīlabhatta 34 38 209 10
 212 231
Kundalunda 230 1
Kundamala 115
Kuntaka Kuntala 166 7
Kutesvaradautya 84
Kūrmapurāna 42
Kuśilāra 99
Kuṭṭanimata 126
Kuṭṭalayunanda 169
Laghu Arhanmīti 181
Laghucandrilu 218
Laghujutaka 190
Laghusabdendu īkhara 154
Laghusiddhantakaumudi 154
lak anu 164
Lakṣmāra 201
Lakṣmanabhātta 147
Lakṣmidhāra 177
Lalitamadhāra 116
Lalitavistara 2 56 9 63
Lalitavatna 70 226
Lanman C R iv
Lassen C 29 12o ii
Lisya 88
Latalamelāla 11o
Laugikīvībhīshaka 201 211
 Levi S 7 66 109n 12o 184
 996 iv
Lilīsuka 127
Lilavati 189
Lingunusasana 1, o
Lingapurāna 42
Locana 61,
Locana ocani 169
Lokāpanda 114

Lokatattvani naya 232
Lokāyata, 233
Lokeśvaratantri, 123n
Lokottaravādin, 52, 54-5, 153
Lolimbaiāja, 86, 186
Lolata, 64, 163
Ludeis, 11, iv
Ludwig, A , iii
Macdonell, A , A 120, 123n,
 125, iii
Machiavelli 180
Madūlasācampū, 146
Madanapūriṇīta, 178
Mādbava, 158, 178, 204, 211,
 216, 234, 236
Mādhavasādhana 117
Madhva, 213n, 218, 220
Mādhva school, 221
Mādhavakāla, 185
Madhyamavyāyoga, 97 102
Mādhyamika, 71, 71n, 72, 223-6
Mādhyamikakāṇikā, 70, 225
Mādhyamikasūti, 225
Madhyāntavibhāga, 228
Madhyasiddhāntakāumudi, 154
Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, 218,
 236
Māgha, 83, 85, 152
Mahābhūṣata, 26-7, 27n 31-6,
 36n, 37, 45, 75n, 81, 83, 85,
 99, 101-2, 108, 112, 134, 143,
 185, 202, 205-6, 208, 213n
 233, ii
Mahābhāṣya, 99, 135, 152 206n,
 207n
Mahādeva, 117
Mahānātaka, 113
Mahānīrvāṇa, 47
Mahāvastu, 52, 55-6, 63
Mahāpriasthāna, 75n
Mahāpuṇāna, 85
Mahārūja-Kanikalekha, 68
Mahāsāṅghika, 53-4
Mahāvagga, 1
Mahāvamśa, 53-4
Mahāvīlācāriya, 189
Mahāvīracarita, 86, 110
Mahāvīrbhāṣā 223
Mahāvīrastotri, 127
Mahāyāna 51-2, 56, 66, 68, 72
Mahāyānaśaddhotpūrṇasūtra,
 66, 227
Mahāyānasūti 68, 70, 223-4
Mahāyānasūtrālanikā, 226,
 228
Mahāyānavaṃśaka, 70, 225
Mahendravikramavaiman, 97
 109
Mahēśvara-upapuṇāna, 43
Mahēśvara, lexicographer, 174
Mahimabhatta, 166-7
Mahimnahstotri, 127
Maitrīlikalyāṇa, 116
Maitīāyanīya, 176
Maitreyanātha, 71, 226 226n
Maitreyarakṣita, 158
Maitreyasamīti, 68
Maitreyavavyākaranā, 68
Mālinīvijaya, 46
Mālinīvijayotta arāttika 46
Mālatīmadhava, 97, 110
Mālavikā, 97
Mālavikāgnimitri, 78n 107 109
Mallikāmāriuta, 116
Mallinātha, 78, 152, 168, 226
Mallīṣena, 232
Mammata, 163, 167, 169
Mānameyodaya, 211
Mānatunga, 125-6
Mānavadharasāstri, 175-6
Mandana, 210-11, 211n , 217
Mānīlūkyakāṇikā, 204n
Mānīkyacandīa, 167
Mānīkyanandin, 231

Māṇikyasuri 96
 Mankba 86
 Manu 176 7 187 202
Manusmṛti 135 175 7 233
Manuṣyālayacandrilā 192
 Maskari Gočila 234
Maria Stuart 122
Maici upapurāna 43
Mārkanjeva 42
 Marshall J H 60n 62n 78n
 iv
Matanga 46
Matangalilā 192
 Mātīcetī 67 8
 Mātrugupta 84
Mat yapaśāna 41 193
Mātharavṛtti 203
Mattavilā a 97 109
 Max Mülleī Γ 48 53 79n
 80n 149 21, iii
Māyākapītlā 98
Mayamata 192
 May Pole 91
Mayūkhamālikī 212
Mayūra 123
Māyurīja 114
 Mazumdar R C 61n
 Medhātithi 135 177
 Medinikīra 174
Meghadūta 79n 85 120 125
 228
 Meghāprab' icāya 114
Menakūhita 98
 Merut ugi 133
Mimīlā a st bha 211
Miśān ānūlramam 211
Mimīlāsūnyāvap al a 211
Miśān usūsūna 135
Mīlārī 177
 Mītrānīsa 179
Moham tg ra 126
Moharājapar-jaya 116

Mucchakatīka 104 5
Mṛgūtāticarīta 87
Mṛge dra 46
Mudrānāk a a 111
Uduītakumudacandīa 115
 Mun J 11
Mugdhabodha 157
mukha 95
Mukūabhatta 162n 165
 Murīlī poet 112
 Murīlī philosopher 209
Nagananda 109
Nīgīrjuna 59 70 8n 71 71n
 183 185 224 6
Nīgī abhatā 153 154n 159
 206
Nāīadhadacarīta *Nāī adhīya*
 carītī 76n 83
Nāīkārīmyāsudhī 217
Nāīrī a 46
 Nakula 192
Valacampū 146
Na apāla 193
Nāīalīngānu usana 174
 Namīśīdhu 16
 Vandana 177
 Nandīkesvīa authority on
 dancing 193
Naīdikēstāra upapūrīna 43
Nāīadapurīna 42
Na as mhapūrīna 43
Nīrada mṛti 177
Nāī ada upapūrīna 43
Nūīyānī Svāhīsudhīkara
 campū 147
Nīrīyānī commentator on
 Manusmṛti 177
Nāīyānī Ma angalīlī 19
Nāīyānībhatta Mānameyo
 daya 211

Nāīāyanabhatta, *Vittaratnākara*, 172
 Nāīāyanapandita *Navaratnākara*, 193
 Nāīāyanapandita, *Hitopadeśa*, 43
 Naīīman, G. K., 58
Nartananiyaya, 194
 Nāīātaka, 95, 97 99, 102-4, 107-15
Nāīātakalakṣaṇaīatnakośa, 168
 Nāīāthamuni, 219
 Nāīātikā, 98, 109, 113-4
Nāīātyadāvpana, 168
 Nāīātyaīāsaka, 98
Nāīāyaśāstīa, 17, 78n, 88, 160, 165, 168, 171, 193
Navaratnāpāīīkā, 193
Navasāhasrākacanīta, 130
Nayaviveka, 209
Nemīnīvīna, 87
netī, 75
Netra, 46
Nidāna, 185
Nighantu, 173
Nilakantha, *Tājīkā*, 191
Nilakantha, *Śīīhanthabhbhāṣya*, 235
Nilamataīīna, 131
Nimbālka, 220-1
Nrbhayabhbīmavyāyoga, 115
Nūnayasundhru, 179
Nūnaratnākara, 181
Nūnīsūra, 122
Nūnūkyāmīta, 181
nūn vahana, 95
Nityagopāla *Kavīatna*, 117
Nyāsa, 83, 152
Nyāyabhāṣya, 196
Nyāyabindu, 196-7, 229
Nyāyakandalī, 201
Nyāyakanikā, 209, 28
Nyāyakumudacandīodaya, 231
Nyāyakusumāñjali, 197
Nyāyalīlāvatī, 201
Nyāyamāñjari, 197
Nyāyāmīta, 218
Nyāyapaiśīśīta, 197
Nyāyapraveśa, 72, 228, 232
Nyāyarakṣāmāni, 218
Nyāyaratnākara, 210
Nyāyasūra, 197
Nyāyasucīnibandha, 197
Nyāyasudhā, 210
Nyāyasūta, 135 195-6, 196n, 200 208
Nyāyasūtīavītī, 199
Nyāyasūtīoddhāra, 197
Nyāyatātparyatīkā, 196
Nyāyātīatāra, 230
Nyāyavīnīścaya, 231
Nyāyaratītīka, 196-7
Nyāyavāttīkatātparyapariśuddhi, 197
 Oldenbeig, H., 93, 146, 36n, 61n
Padamañjari, 152
Padānkhadūta, 121n -
Padānīthadharīmasamgraha, 200
Padānīthakkhandana, 198
Padmanābha, 157
Padmapāda, 216
Padmapurīna, court-epic, 85
Padmapurīna, 42, 108
Padyacūlāmāni, 85
Paksadhaīamīśīa, 198
Pūlakāpya, 192
Pañcadaśī, 217
Pañcānana *Taīkāatna*, 117, 237
Pañcasūyaka, 182
Pañcasidhūntīkā, 187-8
Pañcaśikha, 203
Pañcaskandhāpīakarana, 227
Pañcarūtīa, 103
Pañcatantīa, 21, 143
Pūndavacarīta, 87

Pandavapurana 87
Pāṇini 2 17 19 20 1 34 57
 84 99 149 149n 150 215n
Paolino F 1
Paramalaghumañjuṣa 154n
Paramartha 203n
Paramurthasaptati 71 227
Paramarthasara 46
Paramasamhitu 46
Parīṣṭra 43
Parusaramadharā 178
Parasaraśmṛti 178
Paribhūṣendusekharā 154
Paribhūṣasutras 150
Paribhūṣavrtti 158
Parīkṣamulhasutra 231
Parimala 130
Parimala 216
parināma 214
Parīkṣaparītan 86 132
Parsvabhyudaya 89
Parsvanāthaca ita 87
Parthaparākrama 115
Parthasarathimisra 200 1
Parīkṣiparmaya 116
Pasakakevali 191n
Pasupati 178
Patulavijaya 84
Patañjali grammarian 16 7 20
 34 135 118 149n 150 2
 207n
Patanjali *Yoga* *sutra* 20, 207n
Pathaka 155
Pathetic 110
Patīkāpālik 231
Pauṣṇarāsamhitu 46
Parīkṣāauta 125
Peterson P 78n 79n
Phuyau king 58
Pingala 171
Pischel R 81 89n 91 92n 93
 105n 108 125 m

Pitṛdayita 178
Prabandhacintumanī 133
Prabandhakosa 133
Prabhācandra 132 231
Prabhakara 209 212
Prabhūrakacarita 132
Prabodhacīndrodaya 113 233
Prabu *Idharauhineya* 115
Pradīpa 152 154
Pradyumna 132
Prahasana 97 109 114 7
Prahlañanadeva 115
Prajñādāñḍa 71
Prajñāpīramitū 70 224
Prakarana 97 104 106 110
 115 6
Prālarañapāñcīka 209
Prakaramī 98
Prakīrti *āvanda* 218
Prakīrti *itman* 216
Prakīrti *kalāñja* 81
Prakīrti *paingala* 171
Prakṛiyālāmudi 153
Pramāṇamūlumisra 232
Pramāṇaniruaya 231
Pramāṇapāṇī 231
Pramāṇapravesa 228
Pramāṇasamuccaya 72 228
Prameyal *alamartanī* 231
Prameyaratnākāra 222
Pravāto *īnu* 47
Prapañcasara 47
Prasāda 153
Prasannākāra 81
Prasannapadī 225
Prasannaraghava 115
Prasthīna 89
Prataparudrāya *sobhu* *ana* 164
Pratihārendurāja 162n
Pratijñāya *ugandharayana* 199
Pratīmī 102
pratīmulha 95

Pratinayaka, 89
 Pratītyasamutpādānīdaya, 70,
 225, 228
 Pratyabhijñā, 46
 Pratyabhijñālādaya 46
 Pratyabhijñālātākā, 46
 Pratyabhijñāvimarśini, 46
 Pratyaktautvapradipikā, 217
 Praulhamanamā, 153, 159
 Praulhamanoramālucamardini
 59
 Pravatasena, 137
 Prāyaścittavivaranu 177
 Prenkhaṇaka, 98
 Priyadarśikā, 109
 Priyamvadā, 128
 Pithuyaśas, 190
 Pithvīdhara, 156
 Pithvirūjavijaya, 132
 Puṇyaśāja, 157
 Purāṇa Kāśyapa, 234
 Purvamegha, 121
 Purvamīmāṃsāśānta, 208, 214
 Purvapīthikā, 138
 Puru apārikā, 145
 Puru-ñāh isuddhyupāya 232
 Purusottama, 174
 Purusottamadeva, 158
 Puspadanta, 127
 Puspamīta, Pusyamīta, 73, 78n,
 150
 Quietistic, 95, 113
 Rabindranath, 121
 Radhakrishnan, S 5, 196n, 210,
 216
 Rīgavibhāga, 193
 Rāghavānasañīya, 87
 Rāghavānanda, 177
 Rāghavapīnīlavīya, 85
 Rāghavapīnīśāriyanasaddīya,
 87
 Raghunandana, 43n, 178
 Raghunatha, 198
 Raghunātha Śnomani, 198
 Rāghurāmā, 78n, 80
 Raivatamadānikā, 98
 Rājāñītanī, 206, 207n
 Rājāñekhara, 82, 84-5, 92
 98 100, 112-3
 Rājāñekhara, 14th century,
 133, 165
 Rājayoga, 207
 Rājataranginī, 106 110, 129,
 131, 137
 Rājendra kānapūra, 132
 Rāmabhīdiāmuni, 115.
 Rāmadikṣita, 116-7
 Rāmacandra, Krumudīmītrā-
 nanda, 115 .
 Rāmacandra, Nubhayabhīma-
 vīyayoga, 115
 Rāmacandra, Bhaktisatāha, 128.
 Rāmacandra, Prakriyākāmudi,
 153
 Rāmacarita, 86,
 Rāmācārya, 219
 Rāmakīrti, 218
 Rāmakīrtibhatta, 211
 Rama aranyakya, 191n
 Rāmānuja, 35, 213n, 219, 220,
 235
 Rāmāpīlacakarita, 131
 Rāma Tarkavāgīśa, 157
 Rāmatītha, 219
 Rāmīyana, 21, 23-6, 27n, 28,
 28n, 29, 30-1, 35-7, 43, 82,
 85, 99, 101 2, 110, 113,
 115, n
 Rāmāyānacampū, 147
 Rāmāyanamānari, 86
 Rapson, E J, 61n
 Rasa, 75, 161-4, 166 9
 Rasa janqūdhara, 170

Risaka 98
 Rasamañjari 168
 Rasaratnakara 18
 Rasatarangini 168
 Rasavati 157
 Rasikañjana 87
 Ratrapila 70
 Ratimāñjari 183
 Ratirahasya 182
 Ratisasti 183
 Ratnīkara 85
 Ratnakaranāśāraṇakacura 231
 Ratnapariṇā 193
 Ratnakuta 70
 Ratnāvadanamala 74
 Ratnaprabha 218
 Ratnāvāli 97 109 109n 114
 raudra 7n
 Ratanurjuniya 85
 Ratanatadha 81 82
 Raviṣena 85
 Raychaudhuri H 62n
 Rgveda 29 88 92 107 114
 187 m
 Rjuvimala 209
 Rtusamhara 122
 Ridgeway 91
 Riti 88 161 3
 Roer J 11
 Rosen F m
 Roth R m
 Roy S 78n
 Rozer A 1
 Rucaka 167
 Ruckert F m
 Rudradīman 48
 Rudrata 162
 Rudrabhaṭṭa 144
 Rudrayamala 46
 Rūḍhīmīharana 97 115
 Rupagosvamin 58 116 121n
 169 221

Rupaka 97
 Ruyūka 86 167
 Śabarabha ya 208 9
 Śabarasiūmī 135 203 208 9
 Śabdakalpadruma 13n 174
 Śabdakaustubha 133
 Śabdānuṣasana Hemacandra
 166
 Śabdānuṣasana Śikātiyana 100
 Śabdānuṣasanabhadrīrtti 166
 Śabdaratna 109
 Śabdarīcandra 100
 Śabdarīcandraśākha 191
 Sadīmāndra 218
 Sadīsīva 192
 Saddharmaṇīśākha 69
 Saddarsanasamuccaya 232
 Sadhana 206
 Saduktīkarmīmīta 127
 Sigaranandin 168
 Sahityadarpana 97 116 160
 Sakalakirti 87 232
 Śikātiyana 149 105
 sakti 164
 Śālūntala 78n 79n 90 107 8 1
 Salihotra 192
 Śikātiyha 209
 Samadhi 206
 Samadhiraja 70
 Samantabhadra 230 1
 Samaranganasūtradhara 193
 Samavakīta 97 103 115
 Samaveda 88
 Samayamatīha 127
 Śāmba 43
 Sambhu 127 132

Samhitā, 44-6
 Samyūtāntari, 191
 Samksepaśūriaka, 217
 Samksiptasāra, 157
 Saṃplāpaka, 98
 Sammatitarasūti, 230
 Samskūrapaddhati, 177
 Sanskrit Grammati, 11
 Samudrāmanthana, 97, 115
 Samudrātilaka, 191n
 Samvāda hymn, 92-3, 107
 Samyaktvamuktūvali, 145
 Sanatkumāra, 43
 Sandarbhas, 221
 sandhi, 76, 95
 Sandhyākāra anandin, 131
 Sangītarāpana, 193
 Sangītamakaranda, 193
 Sangītaratnūkara, 193
 Sangītasudarśana, 195
 Sañjaya, 234
 Śankarācetovilāsacampū, 147
 Śankara, 38, 126-7, 135, 210, 213n, 214-5, 217-9, 221, 237
 Śankara, Upaskūra, 201
 Śankhadhāra Kavījā, 115
 Sāṅkhya, 41, 71
 Sāṅkhyakāriku, 203-4
 Sāṅkhyāpriavacanabhāṣya, 204
 Sāṅkhyāpriavacanasūti, 204
 Sāṅkhyasūti, 204
 Sāṅkhyasūtiavittī, 204
 Sāṅkhyatattvakāvumudi, 204
 Sāṅkhyāyanaśautasūti, 33
 Sanmukhakalpa, 193
 sānta, 75n
 Śāntalaksita, 229
 Śāntideva, 72n, 225
 Śāntiparīvan, 233
 Śāntiśataka, 128
 Saptapadāsthī, 201
 Śatapañcūśatikānāmasto, 67
 Saptaśatī, 42
 Śūradūtanaya, 167
 Śūradūtlaka, 47
 aranadeva, 158
 Śūrasvatī akriyā, 156-57
 Sarasvatīkanthābhāraṇa, 166
 sāṅga, 76
 Śūriputriapiakarana, 66, 100
 Śūriñakahbāṣya, 215-16
 Śāmīsthāyāyātī, 97
 Śāṅgadatta, 192
 Śāṅgadeva, 193 .
 Śāṅgadhāra, 128
 Śāṅgadharapaddhati, 128
 Saivadarśanasamgraha, 204, 234, iv
 Saivajñamitī, 126
 Saivajñātmamuni, 217.
 Saivānanda, 133, 173
 Saivasamudrī, 222
 Saivasiddhāntasamgraha, 237
 Saivāstivādin, 52, 56-7, 67, 71
 Saivavāiman, 156
 Sasthitānta, 203
 Śāstīrādarpana, 216
 Śāstīrādīpikā, 211
 Śāstīn, Haraprasad, 62, 65, 79n, 91
 Śāstīn, Pashupatinath, 212n
 Śāstīn, T Ganapati, 100
 Śūśvata, 174
 Śatadūsanī, 220 ,
 Śataka, 122
 Śatapathabrahmana, 187, iii

Satānanda 86 199
Satasūhasrīl aprajñāpāramitā 224
 Sītavīlāna 120
 Satkīryavīda 04
Satruñjayamāhulmya 86
 Sattaka 98 113
Sattasai 120 127
 Sāttvatasamāhitā 46
 Sauddhodani 169
Saugandhulāharana 116
 Saumilla 105
 Saundarananda 65 77
Saundaryalahari 126
 Sauraseni 91
 Sautrāntika 223 4 227
 Sāyana 158 m
 Schiller 122 m
 Schlegel F 27n u
 Schlegel A W von u
 Schopenhauer m
 Schroeder L von 93 122n 125
 Senaka 149
 Senart F o1 iv
 Śeṣakṛṣṇa 116
Sesīa amimāṃsā 220
Setubandha 137
Sevayaserakopadesa 127
 Shadow Sūti 92
 Siddha 145
 Siddhāntal aumudi 153 54
 Siddhāntaleśasamgraha 218
 Siddhāntamuktāvali 218
 Siddhāntapāñcāśilā 232
 Siddhāntasīromani 189
 Siddhasena *Divīkara* 126 230
 Śilāhāmanī 218
 Śikṣasamuccaya 225
 Śilabhadra 228 29
 Śilībhāṭṭīnī 128
 Śīlhana 198
 Silpaka 98
 Silparatna 193
Simhāsanadiātrīmīkā 144
 Sradeva 158
 Sri Pulumāyi 49
 Sisupālāradha 83
Sīṣyadhvīḍḍhītantra 189
 Śītībenā 89
 Sivadāsa 144 145
 Sivadatta 106
 Sivadharma 43
 Sivāditya 201
 Śivadrṣṭi 46
Śnapurāna 42
Śvārkhāmanudīpikā 235
 Śivasvīmīn 85
 Shandagupta 77
Skandapurāna 38 42 108
 Ślokasamgraha 142
 Ślokavartika 210
 Smith V A 5 6 41 ,3 59
 60n 62n iv
 Smṛtikalpataru 177
 Smṛtitratnākara 178
 Soddhala 147
 Somadeva 142 146 155 181
 Somānanda 46
 Somavītha 193 311
 Somaprabha 128
 Somesvarabhatṭa 210
 Somesvaradatta 132
Sphoṭasiddhi 211n
 Sphoṭāyana 149
Sragdharāstotra 126
Srautasūtras 175
 Śribhāṣya 219 220

Śīcārtanya, 198.
 Śīdhāna, 127, 167, 201
 Śīdhārasena, 82
 Śīdhārasvāmīn, 235
 Śīgadīta, 98
 Śīhaīsa, 83, 98, 217, 228
 Śīhastamuktāvalī, 194
 Śīkantha, 235
 Śīkanthabhbāṣya, 235
 Śīkanthacarīta, 86
 Śīkarabhbāṣya, 235
 Śīkīsnacārtanya, 221
 Śīkumāra, 193
 Śīnivāsācāriya, 220
 Śīpati Pandita, 235
 Śīśānkuka, 163
 Śīvaīa, 128, 144
 Śīvatsa, 201
 Śīngūra, 75n
 Śīngūraprakāśa, 166
 Śīngūrasataka 122
 Śīngūratīlaka, 98, 125
 Śīngūravāriṇyataīangīnī, 128
 Śīutabodha, 171
 Śīutaprakāśikā, 219
 Śīutasūgarā, 233
 Stein, M., iv
 Sthāpaka, 92
 Stīnamati, 72, 288
 St. Peter'sberg Dictionary, iii
 Stiauss, 0, iv, iii
 Sēali, 169n
 Subandhu, 34, 39, 46, 138
 Subbacandīa, 87, 231
 Subhāśitamuktāvalī, 128
 Subhāśitātīnasandoha, 127
 Subhāśitāvalī, 128.
 Subodhīnī, 235
 Sucāśitamīśīa, 210
 Subhata, 116
 Sudarśana, 193, 220
 Suddhādvaita, 236
 Suddhādvaitavāda, 231
 Śūdiaka, 105, 105n, 10
 Suhūllekha, 71n
 Śukasaptati, 141
 Sukhāvatīvīyūha, 69
 Śuklānīti, 181
 Suhītasankīrtana, 133
 Śūlapāni 178
 Sungas, 107, 176
 Śūnya 196n
 Śūnyatā, 225
 Śūnyatāsaptati, 70, 225
 Supadma, 157
 Supadmapañjikā, 157
 Supai nādhyūya, 93n
 Supīabhbātastotra, 126
 Suīathotsara, 132
 Suīesvara, 211, 217
 Sūryaśataka, 123, 123n
 Sūrya-upapūrīna, 43
 Suśīuta, 135, 184-5
 Sūtīadhbā, 92
 Sūtīūlankūra, 65, 68
 Suvarṇaprabhbāsa, 70
 Suviūtīlaka, 172
 Svacchanda, 46
 Svāhāsudhbākīacampū, 147
 Svapnadaśānana, 114
 Svapnavāśavadattā, 103-4.
 Svāyambhuva, 46

Svetamvara 229 30 232
Taittiriyāranyāla 187
Taittiriyasamhitā 148n 187
Taittiriyopani abhaṣya
 vārttika 217
Tajika 191
 Takalusu 71 203n
 Tamil Gāthā 219
 Tāndava 88
Tautatitamatatilāla 177 210
 Tantra 44 5 190
Tantralolā 46
Tantralhyayīka 143
Tantrarāja 47
Tantrasāra 46 7 198
Tantrārattīka 260
Tāpasavatsarujacarita 114
Taralā 168
Tirīñītha 67
Tārīñātha Vacaspatya 174
 Tarangīm 219
Tarkabhbhāṣā 201
Tarkamṛta 201
Tarjakaumudi 201
Tarkasamgraha 201
Tārlikharā 201
Tattīabodhīni 153
Tattīacintamāni 198
Tattīacintāmāni yakhya 198
Tattīadipīkā 233
Tattīvapakāśikā 220
Tattīvīthadīgamasūtra 220 21
Tattīvīrthadipalā 222
Tattīvīrthadīpīkā 233
Tattīvīrtharājāvārttīka 231
Tattīvīrthasura 232
Tattīvīrthaslokhavārttīka 231
Tattīvasamgraha 229
Tattīvasamgrahapāñcīlī 229
Tattīvītīka 220
Tattīvītīsaradī 206
Tattīvīvyakhya 199

Taylor I 8
 Thera 54
 Thibaut G iv
 Thomas F W 60n 61n 68n
 iv
Tilakamañjari 147
Tīnantakāmīla 81
Tīpiṭīlā 3 28 34 67 67n
 222
 Tisata 186
Tītīhattra 179
Trīkāṇīṣe a 174
Trūṇīkā 237 28
Tripuradīha 97 110
Tri a īsalākāpuruṣācarita 56
 Trisati 189
Trivikramabhaṭṭā 146
 Trotaka 98 107
 Tscherbitsky T iv
 Tucci G iv
Tuphīka 210
Ucchu, mabhairāra 46
Udattarūgīhāra 114
Udānaragga 224
 Udayana 197 98 201
Udayasundari kāthū 147
 Udbhaṭṭā 161 162 162n 167
 Uddandīn 116
 Uddyota 154
Uddīṣotakara 138 196 97 200
Udīrahatattīra 178
Ujjīvalanīlāmanī 169
 Ulliṭīya 98
 Uluka 203
Umāsvīmīn 230
Umīsvītī 230
 Umbeka 210
Unādīsūtras 155
Unmattaraghava 117
Upakramaparākrama 211

Upamitibhavapiapañcā-kathā,
 145
Upamitibhavapiapañcā-kathā-
sāroddhāra 232
Upanīad, 135
Upaīupaka, 97
Upaskāra, 201
Upavarṣa, 208, 215n
Uribhanga 102
Uśanas-upapuñna, 180
Utpala, 46
utsūha, 112
Utsiṣṭikānka 97
Uttarapuñna, 85
Uttaraiñmacarita, 90, 92, 111
Vācaspati, 179, 197, 201 206
Vācaspatya, 174
Vādīnāja, 86
Vāgbhata, epic-poet 87
Vāgbhata, rhetorician, 168
Vāgbhata, rhetorician 168
Vāgbhata, medical author 185
Vāgbhatālankāra, 168
Vaibhāsika, 223-4, 227
Vaidarbha, 49, 110, 138
Vaidyajivana, 186
Vairjayanti, 174
Vairikūnasadhai masūti a 175
Vairuplyasūti a, 56-7
Vaiñgyaśataka 123
Vaiśeśikasūti a, 200, 201
Vairnavadhai masūti a, 175
Vairnavatosmī, 221,
Varyūkaranabhūṣana, 159
Varyūkaranabhūṣanasāra, 159
Varyūkaranasuddhāntamāñjūśā,
 154
Varyūśikanyūyanūlā, 218
Vāladatta, 123n
Vajrasūci, 67
Vākpati, 110, 130
Vakrokti, 166
Vakroktijīvita, 166
Vākyapadīya, 123n, 151, 155.
Valabhi, 82
Vāluadha, 98
Vallabha, *Nyūyalīlāvati*, 201
Vallabha, *Suddhādvaita*, 213n,
 220, 236
Vallee Poussin, 57 ¹¹
Vālmīki, 23, 26, 28, 36, 81
Vāmana, rhetorician, 82, 105n,
 111, 123, 164
Vāmana, grammarian, 151-2
Vāmana-purāna, 42
Vāmana Bhatta Bāna, 116
Vandūriṇītī, 232
Vāradārāja, grammarian, 151
Vāradārāja, *Tārikākāraḥsū*, 201
Vārahambhūma, 187, 190
Vārāha-purāna, 42
Vāraṇacakāvya, 84
Vārauci, 171
Vārdhamāna, *Kātāntīa-sc'ool*,
 156
Vārdhamāna *Ganarātnamahō-*
dadhi, 158
Vārdhamāna *Yogamañjari*, 192.
Vārdhamāna *Naiyāyīka*, 198.
Vārdhamāna, *Jīna*, 229
Vārivasyārāhasya, 47
Vaiśa, 215n
Vaiśaganya, 203, 203n
Vaiśatantīa, 191
Vāttikābhāvana 210
Vāttikākāra, 150
Vāttikas, 150, 155
Vaiuna-upapuñna, 43.
Vāsavadattā, 138-9
Vaśistha 1 175
vastu, 75
Vāstuvividya, 192

Vasubandhu Asanga 71 203n
 221 237 8
 Vāsudeva *Balamanorāmī* 103
 Visudeva *Sirvabhauma* 198
 Vasumitra 99 223
 Vitsarīja 97 115
 Vitsyījana *Kamasūtra* 21 130
 182
 Vitsyījana philosopher 190 6
 200
Vatsyayanabhāṣya 200
Vayupurana 38 41
Vayu upapurana 43
 Veśintadeśī 121n
Vedāntakaustubha 220
Vedāntaparibhāṣa 218
Vedāntaparīkṣātāsaurabha 220
Vedānta 218
Vedāntasūtra 212 218
 Vedas 11
 Vedic Concordance 111
 Vedic Grammar 111
 Vedic Index 111
 Vedic Mythology 111
 Vedic Studies 111
 Venis 1 111
Venīsamhāra 111 2
 Venkaṭadīkīta 210
 Venkatanītha *Vedāntī*
 deśī 220
Vetalapāñcasāmsati 111
Vibhāṣī 223
Vibhramavīra 211
Vibhūti 206
Vicitralarṇīlāradīna 71
Vidagdhamadhaīa 74
Viddhaśālabhañjīkī 113
Vidhurasayana 211
Vidhūvīra 211
Vidūṣaka 83
 Vidyābhūana S C 190n
 Vidyācakravartin 167
 Vidyādhari 168
Vidyāmadhātīya 190 91
 Vidyāmīndra 231
 Vidyāmathī 169
 Vidyāpatī 133 14, 178 181
 Vidyāranyā 216 7
Vidyāvindara 121
Vigrahātyātartamī 70 22
 Vījikī 128
Vijñāna 196n 226
Vijñānabhāṣyā 16
 Vīju mībhūkī 201 206 237
Vijñānīmīflabha 111 237
 Vīju me Vīra 177
Vijñānīpītīmītrīmīlī 72 227
 Vīkāśīmītambī 124
 Vīkramīdītyī Cāndrīuptī 128
 Vīkramīdītyī Pitron of Nine
 gods 141 173
 Vīkramīdītyī authority on
 archery 192
Vīkramānukālīdīacīrī 131
Vīkramorī 111 112 107
Vīkrīntakaūra 111
Vīlīsālī 94
Vīlīsūkī 39
Vīmarī 93
Vīmī 227 8
 Vīmīkī 111 217
Vīnayāpiṣṭā 1 222
 Vīndhyānī 203n
Vīpralambhīṣṭīngara 90
Vīra 7 11
Vīramītrodāyī 179
 Vīrakīlīdī 111
 Vīrādīvīra Vīrīhārīja 110
 Vīrīlīkī 180
 11 aya 216
 Vīrītīdīvīra 219
 Vīrītīsātītīdīvīra 230
Vīnudharmottara 193 4
 Vīnugupta 180

Viśvapuṇā 41-2, 134,
 238, 236
 Viśnuśāman, 143
 Viśnusvāmīn, 236
 Viśvākarmapītakāśa, 193
 Viśvanātha, rhetorician, 97, 116
 167, 169
 Viśvanātha, philosopher, 199, 201
 Viśvapītakāśa, 174
 Viśvāupā, 211
 Viśveśvāra, 178
 Vitarūgastotra, 127
 Vīthi, 97
 Vitthalācāriya, 153
 Vivādacintāmani, 179
 Vivādaratnākara, 178
 Vivādai nārasetu 1
 Vivarana, 216
 Vivarana pītameyasamgīaha, 216
 Vivalana school, 216
 vivarta, 214
 Vivīti, 202
 Void, 225
 Vopadeva, 157-8
 Vratāvadānamūlū, 74
 Viḍḍhagangasamhitā, 190
 Viḍḍhavūśiṣṭhasamhitā, 191
 Vṛndāvanastuti, 127
 Vīttaratnākara, Kedāra, 172
 Vīttaratnākara, Nārāyana, 172
 Vīttī, Kūśikū 152
 Vīttī, Duṇgasimha, 156
 Vīttī, quoted by Śabara, 208
 Vittikāra, 208, 215
 Vyākaranamahābhāṣya, 148, 151
 Vyākhyāyukti, 227
 Vyaktiviveka, 166
 vyañjanū, 164
 Vyāptipāñcaka, 199
 Vyāsa, 38, 206, 208, 219n
 Vyāsabhbāṣya, 206
 Vyāsarāja, 218
 Vyāsārāma, 219
 Vyāsatītha, 218,
 Vyavahāracintāmani, 179
 Vyāyoga, 97, 102, 115-6
 Vyomaśekhāra, 201
 Vyomaśivācāriya, 201
 Vyomavatī, 201
 Weber, A. A., 8, 28, 28n, 29,
 89n, 109n, 149, 187
 Whitney, W. D. 111
 Wilkins, C. 1
 Wilson, H. H., 111
 Winteritz, M., 26-8, 31, 36,
 42, 36n 65n 66n 109n, 111
 Windisch, E., 89
 Wogihāra, 71
 Wonderful, 110
 Yādava, 174
 Yūdavodaya, 98
 Yūjñavalkya, 178
 Yūjñavalkyasmīti, 177-78
 Yajurveda, 33, 88
 Yamakas, 122
 Yāmunācāriya, 219
 Yaśahpīla, 116
 Yaśāscandīa, 115
 Yaśastilaka, 147, 181
 Yāska, 19, 20, 173.
 Yaśodhāra, 182
 Yaśodharacarīta, 86,
 Yaśodharacarīta, 86
 Yaśomīṭīa, 72n, 224, 227
 Yaśouṇaya, 233
 Yātrā, 125, 125n
 Yavanajātaka, 190
 Yavanikū, 89, 90
 Yoga, 41, 154
 Yogabindu, 232
 Yogācāra, 71, 223, 225-7
 Yogācārabhūmiśāstīa, 71, 226,
 226n

<i>Yogadr̥śīsamuccaya</i>	232	<i>Yogatarttika</i>	206.
<i>Yogamāñjari</i>	192	<i>Yuan Chwang</i>	221 229
<i>Yogasūtra</i>	127	<i>Yuktidūpiki</i>	204
<i>Yogasaraṇīgraha</i>	206	<i>Yuktikalpataru</i>	181 193
<i>Yogaśāstra</i>	127	<i>Yuktivāśikā</i>	70 220
<i>Yogasūtra</i>	205 6 206n 207n	<i>Yuktisnehaprapūrani</i>	211
	208	<i>Yuktyanuvisana</i>	231